

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

MARCH, 1852.

VOL. IV.—NO. II.

PROTESTANTISM AND ROMANISM.

THE quiet of the Protestant Church has suffered no little disturbance of late, by the frequency of the transitions from its ranks, to the Church of Rome. In many instances, these defections have been on the part of men, of weight and decided depth of sanctity, earnestness and theological ability. It has been usual in such cases, to dismiss the whole matter, with but a passing notice of the fact, accompanied with perhaps a sneering expression of pity, in view of such an exhibition of extreme folly, the result either of mental imbecility, or of an hypocrisy more or less well concealed. Such has been the complacency and overweening confidence of many good men in the Protestant Church—such the ease with which they have conducted to its final resolution, much of perplexity and mystery, which engaged the prayers and spiritual travail of the Church of all ages, that should any one still be found, who unfortunately, is unable to sympathize in full measure in their confidence, he is set down as a proper subject for commiseration, or else despised as destitute of all moral principle. All this might do, and pass current

VOL. IV.—NO. II. 7

were it not that recent facts have spoken too distinctly, to allow any longer, such an imagination. It cannot be denied, but that this movement has included men of the first order of mind and spirit. Men, who in the deepest earnestness of their souls, have struggled after a clearer apprehension of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ, and have been led by this step, as *they* fondly trust at least, to the haven of rest.

Now in all seriousness, this subject calls for earnest investigation—for inquiry animated with altogether a different spirit. It becoms us as Protestants, no longer to dispose of the matter in the usual magisterial way, but to challenge ourselves with the inquiry, Is there not some deeper reason for all this, than we have been accustomed to imagine? May there not be a defect, which has led some good men to grow dissatisfied with our religious position? Have these men acted with sufficient reason, or does the difficulty pertain exclusively to their own spirits. Certainly there is room to seek a satisfactory answer to these interrogatories. And since there must be evilsomewhere, and since truth can in no possibility suffer detriment at the bar of inquiry, there is no just reason why it should not be instituted.

There is one aspect of the subject worthy of special notice presented in the fact, that although Protestantism from the beginning, has arrayed itself, in the use of all its superior resources and appliances, against Romanism, yet has it effected comparatively but little in the way of direct opposition and assault, if indeed, in many points it has not suffered decided detriment. This is altogether unaccountable, if the almost universal sentiment among Protestants, that their system is the last, the absolute truth, while the opposite, viz: Romanism is but one tissue of error and corruption, be grounded in truth. The progress of truth has ever been in the midst of, and in unceasing conflict with error, yet has it ever been able, in the end to assert itself victoriously. And such precisely must ever be the issue. But in this struggle, the invincibility of truth seems to be most grievously tried. For upwards of three centuries of untiring conflict, hand to hand, with decided advantages in its favor, has it been doing a fruitless battle, unless indeed it be to have called forth more actively, the resources of what is esteemed the embodiment of Anti-christ; and to have exhibited its inability to impede and overcome its onward progress. Now this might prove of easy and satisfactory resolution, were this struggle included within narrower limits of time and space. Then would we say, error may for a season make a successful stand against truth, as has frequently been the experience of the Church, yet

must the tide speedily turn, and error quail before its power. In this case, however, no room is left for such a solution of the difficulty. Centuries have been engrossed, and world wide has been the scene, and yet do we this day see Romanism, nerving itself with growing energy, with scarcely a wound or a scar to bespeak the severity of the conflict in which it is engaged, and the prowess of the power with which it is at war. Nay more. Just at this time does the tide of success seem to be in its favor and against Protestantism. As we have already seen, many who have sustained a conspicuous part in the service of this latter, and even some from among its champions, have felt themselves constrained, for reasons at least satisfactory to their own minds, to abandon their places in favor of the former. While on the other hand very few if any changes of equal respectability are taking place in favor of the Protestant cause. Why, it may again be asked, all this? Has truth been shorn of its power against error so effectually as to be unable, in this long period to make any material impression upon its enemy—to leave even a trace of its strength upon its deformed body?

It is not a little strange, moreover, that Protestantism, *absolute* truth, as by many it is taken to be, should be unable to commend itself to spirits of the better order, who have been, and still are laboring in the service of the opposite cause. Humanity has an innate affinity for truth; and herein precisely holds the power of truth over it. Error may lead it captive, and hold it firmly bound in its fetters, yet does it recognize truth, when confronted by it; and while it may perversely refuse to submit to its power, it may not refuse its consent to it as truth. Where however, the spirit of man is keenly alive to its moral relations, and earnestly exercised to know the truth, attended besides with intellectual endowments of the highest order, all which are fully possessed by many who find their home in the Roman communion, as we are bound in all candor, as well in common honesty to admit; where such are brought in contact with truth, in the exhibition of both its written and living power—though for *a while* prejudice and education may prevent its embrace, yet may we confidently expect, that presently it will assert its native power, and rise superior to all hinderances. It is not possibly conceivable, that such a spirit, be the outward circumstance of influence never so powerful, could contentedly live in the midst of unmingled error, with the solemn challenge of truth ever addressed to it, without sooner or later in some measure, yielding its consent. It helps not the Protestant cause to deny the existence of such men in the Roman Church. It but creates

against it a suspicion of prejudice and desperation. Such men ever have, and still do live in full honesty and truthfulness to their own deeply earnest convictions, in the bosom of that same church; and the mystery is that they have so found their spiritual wants satisfied in the very sink of corruption and sin, as to enable them to withstand the very truth, for whose refreshing power they ever pant in their inmost spirits.

To the candid, unprejudiced mind, this difficulty calls for some more satisfactory resolution than is usually given—some explanation that, while it asserts the unquestionable power of truth over the human spirit, will at the same time do justice to the piety and devotion, which beyond all question exist within the pale of the Roman Catholic communion. And certainly, none should be more anxious for this precisely, than every devout Protestant. For nothing more deeply concerns the claims of Protestantism itself, as of divine origin, and an embodiment of eternal truth. Should it appear after all, that Romanism is the direct negation of truth, and Protestantism possesses no power to gainsay its pretensions at the bar of the human spirit, then certainly must this last be involved in like condemnation with the first; thus blasting man's last hope for a spiritual home, a sanctuary of rest in this life, and turning loose the hell hounds of infidelity and despair upon a God-forsaken world. Indeed it is not easy to see how good men can rest at all contented with the unsatisfactory and arbitrary solution which is usually given to this awfully solemn difficulty. It would seem, the credit of Protestantism absolutely demands a much larger concession in favor of Romanism than many are willing to make. It is only by acknowledging the existence of truth deep and eternal, sufficient to satisfy the spiritual longings of its devout children, in this, that we can satisfactorily explain the issues of the long continued conflict, with due credit and honor to that. Concede this on the one hand, and the power of truth against error, which is absolute, no longer calls for a doubt as to its existence on the other. Acknowledge truth on both sides, neither the one nor the other free from a serious admixture of error, and the key to the problem is at hand. Truth arrayed against error, truth must ever in the end be victorious. But if truth be violently arrayed against truth, even though error be commingled with it, as is ever the case in this world; inasmuch as truth is eternal and consequently indestructible, the conflict must be a fruitless one for good. Thus too does the error at hand on either side escape the power of the opposing truth, included as it is in the same wholesale assault with its imperishable attendant.

Thus precisely has Protestantism addressed itself to a barren warfare. It has been unmindful of the truth comprehended in the opposing church; and, what is still worse, has to a large extent refused even to acknowledge its existence. As a consequence therefore, it has manifested no concern to save anything as valuable which might be found to exist within it, but aimed at a promiscuous destruction of all good and bad, holy and unholy together. The issues of such a reckless crusade are abundantly manifest in the results already specified.

In addition, moreover, to this, Protestantism has been at fault in its palpable want of proper concern to free itself from anything of error which might haply be found comprehended in its constitution. Unfortunately, an overweening confidence in its freedom from all material admixture of error, has alike prevented, and even interdicted under penalty of the charge of high treason, all earnest inquiry touching this precise point. And even now, although the voice of recent inquiry and developments has spoken so unmistakably, for all who have ears to hear, yet does the man who has heard that voice, and felt the sad verity of its declarations, run a serious venture of losing caste, and incurring the suspicion of being in league with the enemy, if he dares proclaim his solemn convictions. This is much to be deprecated, involving as it does nothing short of treason to the very cause it would advance. That there is error, deep and serious error involved in the Protestantism of the present, which calls for the immediate attention of its friends, it is sheer recklessness to deny. And without all doubt, herein is another grand reason of its want of greater success against Rome, and the movement which we have seen, to be setting in its favor.

The time has come to lay aside prejudice, and with a calm and religious spirit, to contemplate the matter face to face—for a dispassionate investigation, attended with a humble willingness to know the worst of the case, is the only posture of spirit which can give a hopeful promise of success. Argument and history, must supplant magisterial denunciation; and men be honored instead of despised, who point out the seat and nature of the disease which enervates the cause we all love. True wisdom as well all true devotion to our Adorable Redeemer, and his cause, loudly call for this, that if error be found sapping the energies of that cause, it be openly proclaimed. And that man shows himself wanting in a well directed zeal for the truth, who refuses to examine and see whether these things be so. Truth ever invites investigation; error ever shuns it.

To admit the existence of more or less error in the Protestant

movement, by no means involves a sentence of condemnation upon it, or even a betrayal of the want of confidence in its divine mission, and its ability ultimately to fulfil that mission. The Holy Catholic Church, the very infallible body of our Lord Jesus Christ in its ideal character, is nevertheless, in its present actual state, far from exemption from all sin. Its mission indeed involves this. It comes not to catch men as individuals out of the world, and by one exertion of divine power, in a moment to transform them into beings of perfect holiness. It enters rather, *into* the world with all its depravity and corruption, and seeks to grapple with humanity in the midst of these, and by incorporating it, into its own holy body by a process of renovation, in the end to redeem it from the power of sin and Satan. During this process, of course sin is present at every onward step; and it will ever be so until at last the victory will be complete on the resurrection morning. So precisely is it involved in the Protestant movement; as one grand advance in the victorious march of the Church in its militant career. If however the Church would be true to her mission, it becomes it at all times, not to close its eyes upon, and foolishly deny the existence of error, but rather to seek to know it, as an impediment in the way of its progress. Thus will it be enabled the more effectually to exert its irresistible energies to overpower it, and remove it out of the way.

In like manner, on the other hand again, to admit the existence of truth in the Roman Church, and esteem it as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, by no means involves necessarily a surrendry of true Protestant ground, or a subscription to its errors and defects. Errors and defects it has, and it concerns us as Protestants to seek to overcome them. But this can never be effected, as the history of the last three centuries abundantly proves, so long as the effort be to include in the purposed destruction aught of truth. The history of the past is a standing, living argument in favor of the position, that the Church of Rome does embody fundamental truth. It certainly has shown its adaptation in some measure at least, to the wants of humanity, and exhibited its ability to conduct it in the process of its development. This, error can never do. To it we are indebted for our modern civilization; for whatever influence besides, may have contributed to this end, all must have ever remained impotent, without their mainspring, christianity. This found its exclusive abode in the body of this church. The whole gist of the argument consists simply in this—that any institution which possesses the ability to minister *directly* and permanently to the

true development of humanity, must of necessity contain more or less of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ; for in him alone can be found the power, the life, by which only it can be saved from the ever disturbing and destroying progress of sin and death, and conducted in the way of its original destiny. Error may contribute *indirectly* to this end, but never directly. Its tendency continually is to lead astray, not to advance. That this Church has ministered in this direction most materially, is beyond all question. No institution could ever for instance, so effectually have overcome the repeated irruptions of barbaric life, so as to have preserved its peculiar character for good—not to reckon in the account the fact of its being transformed into its own character,—without having at hand some power able to grasp and hold in subjection humanity itself. This, without further reference, the Church before the Reformation did do; and it were to deny all history to controvert the fact. We conclude most naturally then, that this Church does embody a life, which has power to turn our nature from the downward road of sin and conduct it in the way of recovery and life.

Besides, all sound christian feeling must lead to the same conclusion. It certainly will not be denied any longer, at least not by any one who has bestowed upon the subject that charitable consideration of which it is truly worthy—that there has been and still is genuine piety included in this communion. However it may be attempted to account for it, the existence of the fact is no longer an open question. If then there be genuine piety, there must be salvation, and never can salvation be predicated in the absence of the life of Christ. This, therefore must needs be at hand. It helps not the case to say, that these instances are few, and altogether accidental, until it can be made appear that the branch *can* bear fruit dissevered from the vine. The modern theory of the Church will readily deny all this. But so long as it is true that christianity *is a life*, in its literal acceptation, and that all life, to become real and available to the world, must assume some outward tangible expression—and that we have no right to expect to find this life only as comprehended in its proper outward revelation, this denial can effect but little for the issues of truth. Moreover, we find here firmly held and earnestly taught all the leading doctrines of our holy religion, as set forth in the Apostle's Creed, and although these may be attended with grievous error, yet does not that argue any more the want of a churchly character, than the existence of sore error does against the like claim on the part of Protestantism.

As Protestants then, we are bound to discriminate between

truth and error. It concerns us first, if we would gainsay effectually the pretensions of Rome, to know as nearly as possible, what of truth is comprehended in it, and with most studious care seek to deliver it from the fetters of sin with which it may be found to be trammelled. We should learn to respect truth wherever found; and feel that it involves no apostacy from Protestantism, to admire and love and proclaim it, when found animating even the much hated Church of Rome.

The first demand, however, which is made upon the attention of the Protestant Church, just at this time, is to be jealous of its own purity; to give heed to know and remove all error from its own constitution. Let it first cast out the beam out of its own eye, that it may see clearly to cast out the mote out of its brothers eye. Only as this is done, may we look for happy results from the conflict.

To do all this; to discover what is good and what is bad in Romanism, as also, what is truth and what error in Protestantism, we must inquire into the historical significance of each, and the relation of the one to the other. Thus may the way be opened for a just discrimination between falsehood and truth on either side—for a mutual condemnation of the first, and confession of the last.

All history, how diversified and contradictory so ever it may seem in its detail, is but the embodiment of one great process—the gradual unfolding of one grand scheme, conceived and being executed by an All-wise Jehovah. This plan involves in the end, the last design of creation, in the entire range of its economy—comprehending all things in one.

In the early ages of our race, and on through the Old Testament dispensation, we discover the whole order of things to be disciplinary for that which lay beyond in the future, and in which at last, all that preceeded, back even to the beginning, should find its significance and design. In the fulness of time—when types and shadows had accomplished their mission, we find the revelation of the substance in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ; gathering up all things—"the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last," in one glorious living reality, which from that period, on to the final consummation of all things, finds its ever increasing revelation for the world, in his true body, the Holy Catholic Church.

Slavery and death, the first ever involved in the last, was man's dreadful inheritance. "To preach deliverance to the captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised," did Christ come. But freedom from sin and death, presupposes necessarily life, for

aside from life, freedom can never be predicated. Christ came, therefore, into the world primarily, to give it life, and by giving life, to bestow at the same time, all that is involved in its true idea; one element of which we have seen to be freedom. "The truth shall make you free." "If the Son (who is the truth) therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed;" free, in the absolute sense of the term.

But all life involves a process, growth, development. Christ came not to annihilate the dominion of sin by a single stroke of omnipotence, else must the history of the Church, and indeed our own consciousness, prove a sad commentary upon the efficiency with which he accomplished his work. He came rather to cast the small mustard-grain into the world—to deposite in humanity the leaven of his life, which in due course of growth and inherent power of development, should on the one hand become a great tree; and on the other, transfuse the entire constitution with its vivifying power. This tree is the Church, this vivifying power, his life; which is destined to sanctify our nature in the entire round of its existence, both moral, intellectual and physical. Not indeed that this life is susceptible of any growth in itself considered; but only in the process of its enlargement in the world, and its sanctification of our nature in every department. We are led to expect therefore, that the history of the Church will present us an account of this growth, and mark out its onward progress in the midst of conflict and contradiction on every hand.

If then we would learn the significance of any movement included in this process, or the relation of one step to another, we must consult the record of the consciousness of the Church of the past, with due reference at the same time to that of the Church of the present, and in its light. Thus to explore the course marked out by the ultimately truthful movement of the Holy Church of our Blessed Redeemer, attended with the candle of inspiration to direct our steps, we may cherish the hope of a rich reward for our labor.

As being precisely in point, in such an investigation, we may with the greatest profit, keep continually before our mind the deeply significant words of the Apostle Peter. "And besides this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly-kindness; and to brotherly-kindness, charity" (2 Peter 1: 5-7). In these words we discover marked out, the true and only order of the development of humanity; considered either as

general or individual. No other order, can in any possibility, be substituted ; it is involved constitutionally in our nature, and so long as it can make *any* progress towards its perfection, its footsteps must fall in this precise track. Never did a more profoundly philosophical formula find utterance from human lips, than we here find expressed in the language of the unlettered fisherman. By no possibility may we disarrange this order, without contradicting the very idea of legitimate growth in our human life. Temperance, can never take the precedence, in order of evolution, of knowledge ; nor can patience ever lead the way to temperance, in the sense in which the terms are here used. Christianity is but humanity in its perfect form. Inasmuch then as this is in the world at first as the mustard-seed and the leaven, we may look for it to take its onward course of extensive conquest, and intensive sanctification, in obedience to the laws of that nature. To be certified that such has been and still is the order of its history, both in the individual christian, and in its general life as comprehended in the Church, we need, on the one hand, but to consult individual christian experience, and on the other to trace the history of the Church as it has come down to us from the person of Christ.

This order begins of course with the presupposition of life, as it stands opposed to spiritual death. To have faith, is at the same time to have life ; they can never be separated ; both are involved in justification. When therefore, to consider the subject in its individual relation, the sinner is regenerated, when the leaven of Christ's life is infused by the Holy Ghost into his nature, he is invested with a principle, which in obedience to the law of his life will here begin its historic progress, and will continue until he is wholly redeemed from the power of death. The first fruit of this process, is the outward renunciation of the world—the abandonment of the walks of vice, in favor of righteousness. To suppose otherwise, were to fancy that one might, for a season at least, be it never so brief, be dead unto sin, and yet live in its service. Hence the rule of scripture, "by their fruit ye shall know them." The man therefore who reveals not the presence of the new creation within him, by its proper effects upon his life, lacks the first testimonial to justify a hope of its existence. The exchange of a life of wickedness for a life of virtue has ever been esteemed indispensable, to entitle the profession of any one to respect. This exchange is possible however, only as the spirit is enabled, by the quickening energy of the Holy Ghost, to assert itself over against the powers of darkness, which press in opposition to it from within as also from without.

In proportion exactly as this attitude is assumed, does the spirit find itself oppressed by the fierceness of the assault, whose aim is to intimidate and overpower. The very mission of our holy religion involves conflict; and he that would espouse its cause must expect to realize in his experience many a struggle, fierce and lasting. He is called upon to do battle against a power, armed with the weapons, as well of persecution as enticement; to terrify with its frown, or seduce with its smile, the soul enervated by the bondage of indwelling sin.

Of all this does the regenerate soul become speedily conscious. Danger within answering to ruin without, must jeopardize its constancy, only as faith in Christ gives birth to a heroic fortitude, whose energies are drawn out, as trial is at hand. Thus indeed is the christian brought to a proper self-consciousness in the midst of a world of corruption and sin. Only as he is brought thus to assert himself in opposition to his own corrupt nature, and the power of spiritual death, does he truly find himself again, alive in Christ. This courage, this fortitude, this bold undaunted christian bravery—this conscious affirmation of the power of a new life within him, is it, that the Apostle would have added to faith, as its first and necessary production.

The attainment of virtue, as now exhibited, must be taken as but a preparatory step to a conscious entrance upon the history of the christian life. Reason and will entering into the whole routine of his development, intelligence must needs be called into active exercise, by which the individual is enabled to discover his proper existence. Then is he prepared to employ the necessary instrumentalities, to draw out the deep and ever expanding contents of his life. Until then, the child of God is brought to *feel* himself to be a new creature, and apprehend himself, in the midst of a new heavens and a new earth, he remains but a *babe* in Christ, without any clear spiritual perception of his real existence. But when by the power of the new life, unto which he is begotten, he is enabled at last to grow into consciousness, he is prepared for himself, to employ those necessary conditions, which are treasured up in the body of the Church for his use, by which this life is to be nourished, and caused to unfold its activities, which before had lain dormant in his person.

Having made this attainment, the christian is prepared to advance. Not at random, but in a course which is comprehended in the developing power itself. So soon then as he has defined himself, over against all opposition from without, he is most naturally led to turn within and contemplate his own spiritual exist-

ence, his relations and necessities. Hence he discovers a new field of vast expanse, opening up to his view an order of existence to which he had before been lost in well nigh total ignorance. And now for the first time, is he able to apprehend the truth clearly—now only that he has eyes to see, and a spirit to comprehend; for it is only as the power of a spiritual discernment is possessed, that spiritual realities can be apprehended. To know and to understand, is consequently the task before him. Accordingly he betakes himself, with the light of revelation, under the conduct of the Church, to explore the goodly land, to learn its beauties and enjoy its treasures. In a word, man emerging from the darkness of sin, finds himself ignorant alike of his own proper being, his God, and his relations to him; and *in advance* of all else of spiritual culture, he is called upon to surmount the evil in the way of spiritual education. Without this, the possibility of progress is most effectually precluded.

It must not be supposed, that the stadium of knowledge stands disconnected, and in no necessary order of sequence to virtue, which precedes it. It is but its legitimate advance and fuller expression. In the sphere of virtue, we reach the point of the consciousness of a divine life, in its general sense—our eyes are opened intelligently to our true existence as comprehended in it: while in the sphere of knowledge, this general consciousness passes over to the apprehension of the several contents, and their relations, of the spiritual existence, as comprehended in the general life. To grow in knowledge, is but to enter more fully into the idea of this divine life, and appropriate to ourselves progressively, the glorious realities which enter into it as elements. Hence does the Apostle say, with a most profound insight into the nature of spiritual things, "add to your virtue, knowledge."

In proportion as progress is made in knowledge, we look naturally for its corresponding outward expression in the life. This *must* follow. By this attainment, the believer is made to feel most sensibly, his condition as under the power of sin, and his relation and duty to God. The very first truth which fastens itself upon his spirit is, "Ye are bought with a price," which, answered back again from the depths of his consciousness, "I am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ," reveals at once to him, the relation of self to God. Self must be brought into profound submission to God—self must be denied. By nature, this is deified, and crowned with honor, as being the supreme principle in life. It claims to be the embodiment of all authority, and would have the whole world center in it. Its will is its law; and its pleasure, the rule of action

for all besides. It knows no objective authority, it acknowledges no rule beyond the narrow confines of its own individuality. The first practical effect of the truth as just described, *must* be, the entire renunciation of self, as the active principle of *sin*—to feel, and of course to act accordingly, that there is an objective authority—a will to which the individual must hold himself profoundly submissive; which will he discerns in the volume of inspiration. The christian must thus learn to deny himself; and submit most freely to all the will of God—to obey when he commands, to refrain when he forbids. Thus will he add to his knowledge, its natural product, temperance.

This too, is but as it should be; to the end that man may be released from the bondage of spiritual death, and raised to the enjoyment of the liberty wherewith Christ came to set us free. There can be no freedom, in its true sense, without submission to authority. It always presupposes conformity to the law of being. Man *cannot* be free, unless he bows with the profoundest submission to the law of his own existence, lodged deep in his moral constitution—which law is the law of God, and his will concerning him. Nor is this all. Freedom finds not its true idea in *mere* submission to authority. The unwilling slave may yield to the authority, he cannot or dare not resist; yet is he far from being free. It is only as the objective law finds a subjective existence in the individual—only as the will of God is answered by a full, clear and voluntary response, in the will of man, that he is entitled to be called free. Patience must be added to temperance, before he can be said to realize the freedom wherewith only the Son of God has power to set us free.

By patience, the Apostle doubtless means this free consent to all of restraint imposed by the divine life, which embodies God's law upon our sinful nature, as it stands opposed to a slavish obeisance or a stoical indifference. This free consent can grow out only from a conscious perception of its holiness and truth, which we have seen to be involved in the christian history as above traced. In this stadium of temperance, we find the believer reaching the conscious apprehension of objective authority; in that of patience, we see this meeting its complement in a voluntary subjective consent. Thus do we see reason and will alike transfused with the power of the divine life, and man in the profoundest depths of his personality, redeemed to life and liberty in Christ Jesus.

Thus is the individual brought at length to a full consciousness of his vital union with Christ, and is restored again to the image of God. Godliness, or God likeness, is the form of his

being as thus redeemed. Having surmounted in this way the bondage of spiritual death, and attained the clear perception of his relation to the "true vine," he is enabled to perceive also his fraternal relation to all the other branches, and has the power, as never before, to say, from the profoundest centre of his sanctified person, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints."

As such is the order of development of christianity as a new life, as it individualizes itself in the single christian, so too must we expect to find it under the form of a general objective force, as it enters into conscious union with the life of the world. Nor indeed can it possibly be otherwise. The particular can never overstep the general in any respect; for in this alone has it any true import, and must conform to its laws. Nor is it possible for it to outstrip the general in the progress of its evolution. Individual piety is consequently conditioned—takes its complexion, and receives its proportions, from the church of the age in the midst of which it stands; just precisely as the same holds true, in the case of our natural human life. We are authorized, therefore, to expect of all true history the exhibition of this precise order of growth, in the church, from its Pentecostal birth, through its varied fortunes and vicissitudes, on to the period which at any time it may be found to have attained. Nor indeed are we in danger of finding facts in any other relation, than friendly to the spirit of inspiration, as we have its utterance in the language of the Apostle Peter.

Cotemporary with the birth of the Church we find its enemies, in every direction, in array against it. The world beheld in it an order of things, not only new, but for the most part at variance with all that it had been accustomed to esteem holy and of good report. Consequently it was not slow to array itself against it, in the use of all those hellish appliances, which the enemy of all that is good, furnished ready for its service. Persecution, his most terrific engine, was freely employed to intimidate its children, and crush its rising existence. It would seem as though the powers of darkness understood full well its world engrossing import, and would by any means, like their faithful servant Herod, at a previous period, destroy it in its infancy. The more immediate cause of this rage on the part of the world, and the civil power as the executor of its wrath, was doubtless the fact that christianity at once separated itself from it, and by the lives of its true subjects, and the most direct declarations, denounced against it its sentence of condemnation; and the fact also that the introduction of such a vitalizing principle, could but cause

agitation and ferment in the midst of the old life into which it was infused. This was regarded as a direct assault upon all that was held sacred; and as a consequence, in obedience to the dictates of the cruel spirit of the dominant religions, it sought the extermination of this bold innovation, as the embodiment of atheism itself. But violence was not left to do the work of destruction, without the co-operation of the culture of the age. Written attacks were made to inspire a general prejudice against it, and by ridicule and falsehood, to expose it to contempt. Celsus, early assailed it with the pen of derision, while his friend Lucian joins in his mirthfulness over the ignorant fanaticism and inconsistency of the deluded followers of an executed convict.

Against all this did the Church, in the spirit of divine fortitude, make an uncompromising stand. These assaults, whether of outward force or of intellectual demonstration, had but the effect to define the more distinctly the deep line of demarcation between itself and the world, and wake it up to a lively consciousness of its own true character in the midst of opposition and hostility. This was necessary; for only as the Church was enabled to find its proper self, and assert its existence consciously, was it brought to understand its mission,—which was, in turn to grapple with the hostile world around it, cast it down, only however to raise it up again to newness of life. It came into existence like the infant, with the power of life at hand, but required growth, and opposition from the world without to reach a recognition of itself, and thus be prepared to enter intelligently upon its mission. This attainment is what we have already seen to be involved in the christian idea of virtue.

The Church at length, in the good Providence of God, found a respite from her troubles and sufferings. In the face of all opposition, most wonderfully did it assert its own truthful constitution, and extend abroad its borders. Now that quiet was restored, it was led to turn within itself, and inquire into its inward life and relations. Having apprehended its separate existence, it would learn of this existence and its proper contents. As a means to this end, it found itself in possession of revelation; but this portraiture of the divine life in its several features and proportions, could be appreciated, only as it was step by step aroused to a consciousness of them, as they were found in living reality in its own constitution. No delineation or picture of life can ever be intelligible but to the life itself; and that too, in proportion exactly as that life comes to know itself in its several elements and various phases. So with the Church. From the centre of a general consciousness, it must enter into an examina

tion of itself, and learn to know not only itself, but also what this self contained. Hence to study the scriptures and its doctrines, was at the same time but to inquire into the contents and life of the Church. The doctrines of the Bible have no significance or power for the Church, only as they find their substance in its own divine constitution as the living body of Christ.

This growing consciousness required again contrast. It must assert itself over against everything besides, and in all directions. To this end we already see this process of discrimination at work, embracing all that was good, and denouncing all that was bad, as contrary to the life of the Church. This last is *heresy*; which must needs arise out of an attempt to cast the truth after the shapeless mould of sinful humanity, and thus turn it into a lie. Two main heretical tendencies, we find during this period: the Judaizing and the Gnostic. The first grew out of the effort to apprehend the relation between Christianity and Judaism. It endeavored to hold fast to the latter, while it would incorporate the former, as its own completion, and after its own cast give it complexion and shape. This tendency made account only of the temporal phenomena, and clung to the letter, to the neglect of the vivifying spirit. It saw in Christ the long promised King of Israel, a temporal Prince, the Son of man, making all account of his human side, to the disparagement of his divine. The second sprang from the philosophic soil of the Grecian mind. This approached Christianity upon the opposite side from Judaism. It affected to soar aloft, far above the world, and the bondage of the flesh, and live entirely in the spirit. It therefore made Christianity all spirit and no body. It saw in Christ his divinity, but failed to apprehend his humanity. Out of these two tendencies, (not to trace them in their subsequent phases and commixtures) arose the great issues concerning the person of Christ, which for so long a period disturbed the rest of the Church. Thus much, in a brief way, for what is usually denominated the *doctrinal period*; in which we find the Church seeking to know the contents of its divine constitution, and to reduce them to a logical form of faith. Thus did it add to virtue, knowledge.

It must not be supposed however, that this process of self-evolution, was completed with what is usually regarded as the close of this period. Far otherwise. It never yet has ceased, nor will it until the Church reaches its ideal—the perfection of beauty. Each successive step in its history takes up all that preceded it, and carries the whole on to a higher stage of development.

The Church having now made some progress in the apprehension of her own life and character, it must needs give heed to the practical workings of this life. Having learned, as we have seen in the case of the individual, its relation to Christ as its great head, it must now reiterate, to the world, to enlighten and save, the faithful transcript of its own consciousness, "Ye are not your own;" and to teach it wholesome lessons of restraint and obedience. It became the great pedagogic institute to the world, to inspire it with a sense of reverence and submission of self to a power above it. This principle of authority we find embodied in the Church of the Middle Ages. To teach this lesson was the mission of Romanism.

It is not necessary at this time to appeal to facts in confirmation of this position. Nor indeed can any be adduced with equal purpose, to the entire history of that period. It requires no extensive acquaintance with it to satisfy the candid mind, that such precisely is the case. Christendom everywhere was made to feel, that a power was lodged in the Church to which it was bound to submit. No pretension was allowed to array itself in opposition, without being made to feel the weight of its power. That this lesson was most effectually taught, is exhibited in the facility with which the most diverse and barbarous races were brought into the profoundest submission to its authority, and held there in peaceable subjection. The Church, feeling that this lesson was for man in the entire range of his being, hesitated not to overstep the bounds of her *spiritual* guardianship, and to declare to him, that in his political and social as well as intellectual relations, he was no less the subject of its domination. And accordingly feeling the kingly character of the life it embodied, the right of universal dominion both in Church and State, was at length asserted by the intrepid Gregory VII, and realized in some measure, for a brief space, under the administration of Innocent III. Even to this day is this the great principle of that communion, against which so many protests are filed, as something intrinsically bad.

This course of training, we say, was absolutely necessary. Man by nature is devoid of this principle. Sin knows no authority but self; and it is essentially necessary that man be instructed in the truth in this particular; for this principle is indispensable to the idea of human freedom, as is also its co-ordinate element, voluntary consent.

The fact the Church should have been carried into the extreme of the principle of authority, and that at last it put on the form of real spiritual tyranny, is not to be wondered at; much

less does it justify a denial of the divinity of its mission. The Church in its militant state is fallible ; but that does not ignore its divine character. We see similar extreme movements in the case of doctrine, yet all must feel that this argued not the least against the presence of the truth. The tremendous conflicts through which the Church was called to pass, the stubbornness of the material to be wrought upon, the desperate resistance made against it by a wicked and perverse humanity, make it truly wonderful that the Church was competent for the task, and presents an all-sufficient apology for the errors into which it fell. And to say now that all this was the workings of the Devil, and the embodiment that wrought it was none other than Antichrist, is verily to attribute to him a work which he would be the last to accomplish. It is to have a house divided against itself. The Devil, with his most powerful agencies, to array himself against his own cause, and conduct humanity half-way towards its emancipation from his power ! Truly would it be well for many now in the world should he betake himself again to a similar work. No. It was the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ that wrought all this ; that same Church which having accomplished the complementary step to this movement, in the process of its history, will present man free in the fullest sense, from the dominion of death. The Catholic Church of the middle period wrought this work, and although it did err, and sin, and apprehend the truth in an extreme way ; yet, nevertheless does it stand to its credit precisely to have added temperance to knowledge.

In due course of time we find this Middle Period to have opened the way for that which was to follow in legitimate order. Not as something foreign to it, or in reality hostile ; but as its necessary product and outbirth. And such indeed it must have been, if it would make good its title to respect. To assert that it came from abroad, even as a direct revelation from heaven, is to deny that it was involved in Christianity from the beginning. To attempt however to invest it with this character, in the absence of all miraculous authentication, is to strip it of its last claim to our respect. The Church must at any period, comprehend the whole idea of christianity, either consciously or unconsciously, as the embodiment of the indivisible life of Christ. It must therefore include at any time, potentially, all that ever can be subsequently evolved, in the way of true history. Hence must that which followed the Church of the Middle Period, and all which may yet follow on to the end of time, as the product of christianity, have been included in its life. This, as just

intimated, may have been unconsciously to the Church; but this argues not a whit against its parentage or the legitimacy of its birth.

The mission of the Church of this period, which as before said is the Roman Catholic, was to assert the claims of christianity as a general objective life. The individual must feel that he stands in a life vastly more general and extensive than himself, in which only he can live, and from which he derives his significance. Sunder him from the general, and he becomes an anomaly, a monstrosity. This mission in the midst of huge difficulties, it was successful in fulfilling; not however without a onesided and extreme tendency. Against this violent ejection of its life from its central channel, it must needs protest, and a reaction take place. This life embodied the principle of law, but not in the form of tyranny. The general must assert its claims, but not at the expense of the individual. This last, too has its rights, and to be in lawful relation to the first, it must be not in the attitude of a forced, but a voluntary consent to its claims. All oppression must in the end beget revolution. And such, without qualification, was the nature of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was the protest of the divine life itself, against the abuse to which it had been subjected; and the assertion of the rights of the individual over against the tyranny of the embodiment of the general.

Thus we find the Church conducted on to its third period, (more properly perhaps, the last stage of the second) the stadium of patience, asserting the co-ordinate element of the true idea of freedom. This period sustains a different relation to the one going before, from what that did to its predecessor. The doctrinal period engaged the activity of the Church in the way of conscious reflection upon its contents, and the reduction of these to a logical form. The one following, found it embodying these same in the form of active life. But this, as we have already seen was but partial, one-sided. The two great co-ordinate elements of human life, reason and will, it would seem require to be evolved, not simultaneously, but separately and in order of sequence, reason of course taking the precedence. This consequently found its expression first. But in this separate form it could but be one-sided and extreme. Hence did a maimed consciousness call accordingly, for the revelation of its complementary side in the same form of active life in the Church. And this precisely is it, which is to employ mainly its activity in this last period. It is not so much to supersede as to complete—not to destroy, but to inspire with healthful life. The mission of

Protestantism, which is no other than the development of the principle of patience, is not to uproot and destroy the Roman Church, but to complete it, by supplying what it lacks. The idea embodied in each is indispensable to the idea of christianity itself. Destroy either, were it possible, and you well nigh destroy the other; or at least doom the Church to repeat the spiritual labors of by-gone centuries. Neither one separately taken gives full expression to christianity, but the two together, conducted onward to a harmonious union in the form of godliness, the next step in the process of development marked out by the Apostle.

As already declared, the authority of the general objective church-life, had been carried out in an extreme way, to the injury of the individual subjectivity, in the Church of Rome. Against this we find the divine life entering its protest, in assertion of the rights of the latter. It was felt that the Church was the living body of Christ, and as such, had alone the power to impart life to the individual. To it, therefore did this last stand subject. To it pertained the authority to declare what was truth, and what consequent duty, as comprehended in its own constitution, and set forth in the word of God, as its inspired revelation. But it was likewise felt at the same time, that this did not require the negation of the activities of the individual, but their most intense voluntary exercise. He must submit to its instructions and yield it obedience not as a matter of coercion, but of consent, induced by a perception of its truthfulness.

But unfortunately, as is ever the case in the history of humanity, laboring under the disorganizing effects of sin, the reaction from one extreme, tended irresistibly to the other. This however was necessary, that the mission of truth with reference to the human world might be accomplished. Its several elements must assert themselves first in a separate way, involving more or less of opposition, until at last having inspired humanity with their mutually attractive energies, the way is opened up for a coalescence in the form of life. It was necessary therefore that the principle of authority should first assert itself under a separate form, and that subsequently its opposite, yet co-ordinate side, should come to a like separate declaration. In the history of each, we must look for distortion and extreme. They must grapple with the world, and pursue it with their subduing power to the opposite extremes of lawlessness and slavery, and bring it back from its wanderings to inward harmony and reconciliation. These elements, working this process of renovation, must of course for the time being, partake more or less of the complex-

ion of the corrupt life, into union with which they are brought ; and only by slow degrees to overcome its hostility—cleanse it from sin, and at the same time leaven it with their own vitality.

The history of Protestantism, from its beginning to the present time, has manifestly labored under this one-sided tendency. It had no mind at first to repudiate its allegiance to the Church, by denying its authority ; but sought rather to assert the right of the individual in full consonance with his true relations to it. This however was impossible. And the very first indication of this impossibility was the exercise of the arbitrary power of the Church itself. The new movement was compelled to assert itself in a separate way. And as extreme ever begets extreme, so has Protestantism continued in an increasingly divergent course. As the principle of authority ran over into tyranny, so the individual will has run out into wilfulness. One is taken as the negation of the other. The claims of the objective, it is imagined, require the denial of individual rights, while on the other hand, the rights of the individual require a like denial of all objective authority. This last has unfortunately come to be to a large extent the standard of truth in the Protestant Church. Here the authority of the Church has come to be the next thing to nothing ; its existence as an objective reality for faith—a Romish superstition ; its body as the repository of life and salvation—a nonsensical fancy ; its consciousness, as the living perception of the truth—a denial of the authority of God's word ; its claim to be the divinely commissioned interpreter of scripture—a soul endangering error of Rome ; as to the sacraments possessing the power of an objective grace, to be apprehended, not created, by faith—this is downright heresy ; and inasmuch as all these dreadful superstitions, might be found involved in the admission that christianity is *a life*, it is extremely dangerous, to say the best of it, to promulge such a doctrine.

Thus most effectually is the idea of the Church as an objective life-bearing institution repudiated. As a consequence of this again, man has to do with God immediately and for himself. He approaches him in the exercises of prayer and the study of the Bible. His blessings are transmitted, fresh and first handed, direct from heaven by the express agency of the Holy Spirit, who he believes dwells in him in some strange way. His knowledge of christian doctrine—which by the way, is altogether a matter of secondary importance, it is well to have some share of it, but he can reach heaven with that share being very small—for this he asks no favors of the Church—he has his Bible and from it he can learn the mind of God for himself ;

and he is just as able to discern that, in its lucid teachings, as the whole Church put together. If the Church differs from him, as to the meaning of scripture in any particular, he of course is right, and it is wrong. Should he find however that his own Church differs with him, and condemns his judgment; this still affects not the truth which for himself he drew from the great *source* of all truth, the Bible. He still is right, and his Church is wrong; and hence he must go out from its midst and establish the *true* Church, based upon nothing but the Bible. He will preach the *pure* gospel; and all the world besides, failing to believe as he does, is in great danger of being lost. The sacraments of course he will observe, because Christ commanded it, but had he not done so in so many words, there would have been no duty in the case; and he cannot see that christians would have suffered any special detriment for the want of them. The Church too, is a very clever institution. It is important, to the end that the preached gospel may be secured, and efforts put forth for the salvation of souls. It is well to be in connection with the Church; but not a matter of any very great importance. Many souls reach heaven out of it. Only so they have the Bible, and by reading it are brought to repent and exercise faith in Christ—all which must be done at any rate, before the Church can be of any benefit to them—it is a matter of small moment, touching the soul's salvation, whether they ever connect themselves with it or not.

Such in a general way, we may say, has come to be the sense in no small degree of the Protestant body. Of course many exceptions are happily to be found. Yet as a whole, it cannot be denied, but that it has lost all confidence in anything like an objective church life. No spiritual authority is acknowledged but the Bible, and this is to be interpreted by each one for himself. The individual judgment is fully competent for this task, no matter if it does address itself to the work, under the bias of all manner of preconceived notions. In short, the understanding is the measure of truth, and all things, consequently must square to its rule. Faith has nothing to do in the interpretation of scripture. The understanding must do this alone; and then afterwards, faith is bound to subscribe to its conclusions under the penalty of the charge of infidelity. According to this view, faith consents to truth, not as apprehended by its own power, but as presented and certified by the finite understanding; although Paul who is of *some* authority upon such points, conceives faith to be its own evidence; he says it (faith) is *the evidence* of things not seen.

The tendency of this rationalistic spirit is to run out into the most iniquitous extremes, as has been realized in but too many instances already. Having laid down the fundamental proposition that christianity is but doctrine, to be apprehended by the understanding, it has proceeded to bring everything down to its level. No room consequently is left for mystery. Even the doctrine of the Trinity, not to mention others, must divest itself of this character and become perfectly comprehensible. As a matter of course, three cannot be one, nor one, three; therefore Christ is not God. But one more step remains to be taken to develop its last consequence—nor has it been left untried by some at least—which is, that all religion is a farce, sin a dream, and man what he ought to be, acting in obedience to the impulses of that nature, which just as it is, is the handiwork of God. Thus does this theory run out, in the form of reflection.

Its practical workings are ultimately no less dreadful. Denying at the start the authority, nay, even the existence of the objective, every thing becomes subjective. Doctrine is not supposed to have any vital relation to christian experience. It is held to be something foreign—a mere appendage. There are points which for some reason are made to be essential to salvation, but so far as the understanding can see, they are very few in number. Upon most points it is a matter of perfect indifference what a man believes, only so he has the proper subjective exercises—so “he feels right.” This is the *sine qua non*—the unadulterated essence of religion itself. This again is taken to be the direct workings of the Spirit of God. The more intensely, therefore, any one *feels*, the brighter the evidence of his favor in the sight of God. That the feeling should at times become too intense to be contained, is altogether reasonable, being divinely wrought. In such cases they ought to be expressed in the way they may happen to seek utterance. To attempt to repress them, is to strive against the Spirit. Thus is the door opened to all forms of fanaticism.

Again—this *doctrine*, which is the outward form of christianity in the sense just described, is to be determined by every man for himself, as he understands the Bible. If his understanding be affirmed by any existing creed, to that he bows assent. If however he find no such an one, then verily are all wrong, and he alone right. If his circumstances—no matter for education—justify the step, he must needs proclaim himself a reformer, and establish a Church which alone enjoys the preaching of the gospel in its *purity*. Here we have the sect system—the practical expression of the notion which animates this whole ultra-movement.

Now in all truth this is any thing but patience. Indeed it is absolutely excluded, in favor of impatience—an imagined superiority to all authority, all law. And yet such is at least the tendency, if not indeed in many cases, the actual form of the Protestant element, in the way of extreme movement. And what renders this state of things still more deplorable, is the fact that we have no right to think that the movement has yet reached its culminating point. The present indication of things, rebukes such a fond imagination. The aspect, just at this time, of the political horizon—for it must be borne in mind, that humanity as a whole is the subject of this historical process—gives a most portentous promise of approaching evil. The prevailing idea seems to be, that the powers that be are ordained of the Devil, and not of God—that inasmuch as man is bound to submit to no authority, but of his own creation, he is at liberty to throw off all existing restraints, assert his natural right of absolute self-will, and then dispose of himself as he may deem proper. In full harmony with this, we find persons of a certain stamp, who, happily having outstripped their less fortunate brethren, have attained the glorious eminence of truth, where all government vanishes into smoke, and all restraint is discovered to be oppression. But one step higher in their case, and doubtless they will arrive at the full persuasion, that it is the will of God, to have every man do precisely as he pleases.

What will be the ultimate issue of this tendency, God alone can tell. Yet cannot one well avoid venturing a conjecture. A recent writer¹ of unusual ability, has with much good reason, supposed this movement to be the revelation of the man of sin, spoken of by Paul in 2 Thes. ii, and its final issue to consist in the revelation of "that Wicked," "whom the Lord shall consume, with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." As very justly observed, in the same connection, in translating the word rendered in our English version, "that Wicked," "we lose a confirmation of this view, which this word more accurately rendered would give us. He is not simply the *wicked* one, but ὁ ἀνόμος the *lawless* one; and the mystery is not merely a mystery of iniquity but of lawlessness (ἀνομίας)." He seems to think, that what we have seen to be the perversion of the Protestant element, is the final Antichrist, who is to exalt himself "above all that is called God,"

¹ Trench, Hul. Lec., page 147.

and show "himself that he is God," whose destruction is to be in the event of the coming of our Lord.

There is much to invest this opinion with plausibility. The "lawless one," does most certainly seem to meet his identification in the spirit of insubordination with which the Church and the world are filled, and besides, this lawless spirit is the perversion of the principle of patience, which according to the Apostle Peter is the last period in the advance of the restoration of man to the image of God—godliness as he expresses it; during which last period, we may not greatly err in supposing the advent of that Lord will take place, the brightness of whose coming will be the destruction of Antichrist.

From this review of the whole subject we arrive at this conclusion: That Protestantism and Romanism, as the embodiment respectively of the two great elements of that liberty wherewith Christ came to set us free, are not *inherently* inimical to each other—that each embodies, in the midst of all its errors, its most precious truth, which is the complement of the other—that to destroy one, were it possible, would be to inflict a most grievous injury upon the other—that each one is absolutely necessary to the perfection of the other. While all this is true, yet are they violently held asunder by the sinfulness of humanity, which sin has rushed each to the opposite extreme from the other. The duty, consequently growing out of this relation is, that each one be concerned primarily with its own defects and sins, not however despising the friendly offices of the other; (and especially is this applicable to Protestantism just at this time, when it is manifest that we have more to fear from perversion on this side, than we have from the errors and corruptions on the other,)—that in no event should one attempt the wholesale destruction of the other; but in all controversy, carefully to discriminate between truth and error, and seek to deliver the first, wherever found, from the just condemnation of the last. So then at length, when each shall have accomplished its separate mission, they may happily be brought to a joyful marriage, and present to Christ at his coming the world redeemed, and the Church in outward body one, as ever it has been in inward life, in the form of godliness. And out of this shall grow in due course of development, brotherly-kindness, and that last and greatest of christian graces, charity.

Jefferson, Md.

S. N. C.

PHILOSOPHY OF PERSECUTION.¹

THE history of Persecution is prolific of phenomena which are not more lamentable, then they are startling to the inquiring mind. The mere *fact* that man is so prone to intolerance of the opinions of his fellow-man, especially in the sphere of religion, and that he can exult with furious delight over a victory won by means of the rack, the faggot and the axe, is a fact at once curious and startling. This fact and the attending phenomena have been viewed differently by different minds, according to their respective points of observation. The philosophical indifferentists of the English and French schools, and a large class of religious sentimentalists such as St. Pierre and Fenelon, have, respectively, ridiculed or wept over *man's unaccountable madness*; while others, with more virulence, reckon these phenomena as the legitimate fruit of the religious principle, as though the religious principle were the artificial product of priest-craft, and not an essential element of human nature.

In endeavoring to account for the persecuting spirit, we may say in one word that it springs from the *depravity* of human nature. The schism between God and man was necessarily and speedily followed by a schism in humanity itself, by which its forces were arrayed in malignant antagonism. The commandment second in importance, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," follows not only in the order of time, but in the order of sequence, upon the first and greatest, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." And not less legitimately does hatred towards man follow from hatred towards God. The persecuting spirit is utterly irreconcilable with the primitive condition of man, as tradition and nature hint at, and scripture reveals it, and can be accounted for properly, only in connection with a *lapse* of the race. But as the fall introduced no new elements into our nature, but only disturbed and distorted those already existing, we will endeavor to trace the phenomena of persecution a little more closely.

We may say with safety, that every great historical phenomenon springs from some deep, abiding principle of our nature: and when it assumes a malignant or destructive form, it is only

¹ The historic material used in the preparation of the present article was derived from the following sources:—*Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*; *Nesander's History of the Christian Religion and Church*; *Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*; and *Milman's History of Christianity*.

the abuse, the abnormal development, of some legitimate, or properly human principle or tendency. There is no such thing as a general movement in society, no matter how wild and irregular, that is untraceable to some principle of our nature, any more than there is a wild, swollen, inundating river, that cannot be traced to some fountain head. True, there may be many collateral influences. The original principle may be almost lost sight of amid the multitude of adjuncts which conduce to the final result, just as the river may have many collateral branches which furnish the great body of water which gathers towards its mouth.

It may aid us in this inquiry if we premise, that persecution has not been confined to the religious world. It has raged in the spheres of politics, philosophy, science; everywhere indeed that a difference of opinion was possible. To be heterodox in politics, in the days of the French Republic, was as dangerous as to be heterodox in religion, in the times of St. Bartholomew's eve. To be heterodox in philosophy, in the days of the Realists and Nominalists, was as uncomfortable, almost as dangerous, as to deny the dogma of transubstantiation in the days of Hincmar of Rheims. Heterodoxy in science, as the world judged, brought Galileo upon his knees before the tribunal of the Inquisition; and the discovery of fluxions was the occasion of no little persecuting rancor. If, then, we would discover a principle which lies at the bottom of all persecution, it must be a *human* principle. It must be expansive enough to cover the entire field of our nature, and capable of almost endless combination with the various lateral forces, which may determine the precise character of the phenomena. It must be universal in its applicability to every sphere of thought, and capable of adjusting itself to the national and ecclesiastical, as well as to the individual life. Whilst these conditions may be justly required of it, it is not required that the ultimate principle should account for all the phenomena. Large allowance must be made for adjunct and circumstantial influences, which may almost hide from view the primary, moving agency. The plastic power in nature is scarcely thought of, amid the circumstantial influences of rain and sunshine and changes of season. And yet this power moves the panorama of nature. It is not required of any pervading principle, that it shall be the alone sufficient cause of every varied manifestation. All that is demanded is the power of combination and adjustment, which circumstances may require. Historians find it necessary to discover different causes, for every separate outbreak of persecution since the world be-

gan. These are often purely accidental, and bear no relation or similarity perhaps in any two cases. These however are but the occasions, which call the deeper principles of our nature into play. There may be room even for the admission of Satanic agency. Such agency uses the powers of our nature as its instruments. The powers of darkness are able to accomplish nothing in the world, except as they wield to their own purposes the materials already existing. Even though we admit that every persecution through which the church has been called to pass, or which she has been tempted to perpetrate, was an effort on the part of the "prince of the power of the air" to prevail against her, yet must we admit that the artillery for the diabolical onset has been gathered from the arsenal of human nature. The unclean spirits, which "are the spirits of devils," "go forth unto the *kings of the earth*, and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

Let us assume, then, that the fountal source of the persecuting spirit is the *strong sense of individuality*, which underlies every man's feelings and actions, and see whether it will meet the conditions required. This, we conceive, is reducing the moving cause of the phenomena to its ultimate elements, its last degree of simplicity, and it may be difficult to retain so slender a thread amid the sanguinary and world-convulsing scenes through which we may be called to pass.

Every man, to a greater or less degree, considers himself the centre around which every thing in the shape of opinion ought to revolve. Every man has almost as much confidence in his own perceptions and logical deductions as in his senses, and he very naturally makes these the standard by which he measures the perceptions and deductions of others; and of course he cannot look with indifference upon any who pronounce them false. He feels that the foundations of his knowledge are being impaired. It is not easy to remain unmoved, when told that these mental progeny, these idols of the brain, are mere inane phantoms, if not the dark-visaged children of falsehood. A process of ratiocination which is perfectly clear to one man's mind, he is disposed to think, ought to be so to another's. This, it strikes us is the ultimate solution of the mighty war of opinion, which has ever convulsed the world; and the collateral aid of the malignant passions,—which is easily afforded by the close connection of our emotional with our rational nature,—is all that is needed, together with the necessary power, to give birth to the persecuting spirit in its most hideous and desolating forms. Take a homely illustration. A plain, thoughtful farmer meets

his neighbor at a partition fence, on a bright summer morning, and submits to him a proposition, perhaps in the sphere of vital truth, which he has reached through many hours of midnight thought and noonday musings, and which he has now elaborated and polished, until to his own vision it seems transparent as the light. The duller perception of the other cannot see it, or perhaps some previous bias leads him to spurn it. Then follows an effort to save the cherished idol, by exhibiting its claims and its beauties. Thought grapples with thought. Mind is pitted against mind. The passions come into play. And finally, if violence is not resorted to, the neighbors part with the mutual epithet of "fool." It requires a calm philosophy, the result of thoughtful culture, and wide views of man's more remote relations, to enable the ardent lover of truth to brook with perfect complacency a dogmatic difference of opinion. The same causes operate upon the masses of men. Organizations, whether social, political or religious, may be roused to violence in the same way as individuals. The world was more than five thousand years old, and European Civilization, with all the advantages of christianity, had toiled on for ages through blood and strife, before even the most enlightened portion of mankind learned the great principles of *toleration*. The discovery marked an epoch in the progress of humanity. It showed that a great stadium had been reached, in the ascent of the race to its final goal.

The outworkings of this principle may assume various phases; but all will be found more or less closely connected with the sense of individuality. The persecution of the few by the many, so common as to be almost proverbial, is not because the disposition to persecute is confined to the many, but because they possess the necessary power. The persecuting spirit is born in every man, who feels the shrine of his individuality invaded: and this the many feel, when the few possess or profess anything distinctive or exclusive.

Before proceeding to test the principle we have named by facts, let us inquire what is the *final cause* of the existence of such a principle in our nature? Why has God endowed us with a mental pugnacity so prolific of all that is evil and heart-rending? We answer, precisely because there is such a thing as *truth*, and the capacity on the part of man to perceive it; and such a thing as *error*, or incapacity to perceive truth or wilful perversion of it. The human mind is capable of perceiving truth, or arriving at it by logical deduction; and the perception or logical result is sure and unerring, in proportion to the gifts and acquirements possessed and the freedom from disturbing in-

fluences. And when man has thus found truth, or even fancies he has found it, it is the ordinance of God that he should speak it out and contend earnestly for it. The inherent strength of genuine truth will secure it the victory. It is this strife of intellect, this Olympic emulation of thought, which rolls forward the wheels of the world's progress. Errors, perverted truths, and all such abortive efforts of the wrestling mind, gradually fall back and are covered by the dust of the course, while the genuine treasures of truth are borne along and become incorporated into the knowledge of the race. And in the sphere of religion this strife is the fiercer, just because here is enshrined the most precious truth, and here are developed the most gross and hideous perversions. This is the sphere, not only of the highest speculative truth, but also of *revealed* truth; and this is to be defended as well as believed. This duty the christian and the Church must discharge. Nor is this duty entrusted to the force of a mere injunction, operating upon the man mechanically from without. A connection has been wisely ordained between its discharge and the feeling of individuality; so as to furnish a motive power from the deep arcana within. A man's opinions, much more his religion, become part of himself. They are cherished and defended with the same jealousy that guards the citadel of his own being. To touch them is to touch himself. Not that we would teach that we are purely selfish beings. The current bad sense of the term "selfishness" makes it inapplicable, to describe the relation wisely instituted between our actions and ourselves. The grasp of religion upon our individuality in the way spoken of is the stronger, because it is fraught with the most startling and momentous personal consequences.

The fact that this principle applies in the case of error as well as truth does not vitiate it. On this equal footing, in this fair contest, as it has been wisely ordered, "truth is mighty and will prevail." Though the forces of humanity may be as available for the service of error as of truth, yet is it neither irrational nor unphilosophical to rest the triumph of the latter upon the wisdom of Him who "turneth the hearts of men as the rivers of waters are turned."

This enlistment of the selfish principle—using it in its better sense—does not destroy the sense of responsibility as resting upon the man from without. Both go together; and the latter is pressing in proportion as the former is absorbing. A remarkable proof of the power with which this responsibility took hold of the mind of the primitive Church, is exhibited in the fearful *anathemas* with which not only general councils, but petty

synods and even single bishops, prefaced their statements of fundamental doctrines; and yet, in this defence of the truth as it is in Jesus, the sense of individuality was as much enlisted, as though it had been a warfare *pro aris et focis*. Persecution is only the perverted, abnormal development of this principle, when the soil from which it springs is poisoned and imbibited by superstition, bigotry or unholy ambition. It then assumes functions which do not belong to it. While God commands us to "contend earnestly for the faith," he gives us no authority to punish.

The persecuting spirit, thus springing from the perverted working of the principle of individuality, may assume different types or phases, according to the point of impingement upon the sense of individuality, by which the direction of the rebound is determined. It may assume the type of pure jealousy, the offspring of a selfishness which can brook no rival. Or it may be the result of fear,—the convulsive effort to crush a rival, whose threatened ascendancy is dreaded. Again it may arise from pure malignity, the fiendish principle of hate, the existence of which has been rendered possible by the schism in human nature. Much of the blood of the French Revolution flowed to appease demons incarnate, who hated their kind. One of the most inhuman butcheries of the Reign of Terror, which made the streets of Lyons flow with noble and virtuous blood, resulted, in no slight degree, from the fact that ten years before Collot d'Herbois had been hissed off the stage as an indifferent comedian. Sometimes indeed the sense of individuality may account for the absence of persecution. Where there is a feeling of confidence, a consciousness of strength and security, and a self-sufficiency which looks down with contempt upon all difference of opinion, there may be little stimulant to persecution. As an instance in point, Frederick the Great may be cited, who gave a similar welcome, and afforded an indiscriminate shelter, to all forms of religion and irreligion within his dominions. And yet there were points in which his individuality might be invaded, and to do so was most hazardous. A similar reference might be made to the strong, iron-nerved Roman Governor, who said, "I have found no fault in him," and yet delivered up the Just One, with the cool remark, "see ye to it."

Having thus defined what the principle is which we propose, and having seen what is, and what is not, required to establish it, let us proceed to test it by facts; to discover if we can, by glancing at some of the leading persecutions which history records, the connection between it and the actual phenomena.

We shall confine ourselves principally, for the sake of brevity and clearness, to the persecutions which christianity elicited and endured, in its contact with the old forms of religion.

Let us trace first the persecuting spirit of the Jew against Christianity.

The mission of the Jewish nation as the conservator of God's blessings and promises, and the peculiar sactions and restrictions by which this character was preserved, necessarily nurtured to its highest degree the feeling of exclusiveness and nationality. There was little room for sympathy with the unchosen and uncircumcised. And if it be true that a man's opinions and his religion become part of himself, the connection between the feeling of nationality—the religious nationality of the Jew especially—and the sense of individuality is manifest. The former is the development or expansion of the latter. A man becomes identified with his nation, and to carp at his nationality, is to arouse the ire of self. Now on this side precisely did christianity impinge upon the individuality of the Jew. It proclaimed itself a universal religion. It broke down the middle wall of partition, between the religious and rigid nationalism of Judaism, and the outside nations of the uncircumcised. It proclaimed that the blessings which had heretofore been confined to the chosen nation, and watched with such jealous care, were now to become the common heritage of all men. It did away the sanctity of particular localities. The bitterest complaint against the great Apostle of the Gentiles was, that he "had gone about to profane the Temple," which was the centre around which their nationalism clustered; and the bitterest scoff against the bleeding Redeemer was, "Thou that destroyest the Temple." With this feeling of nationalism, and Pharisaic sanctity and exclusiveness, the Jew was prepared for fierce intolerance and relentless persecution. A fine example in point is furnished by Paul himself, before his conversion. He was the very embodiment of Jewish nationalism and Pharisaic self-exaltation; and with these christianity came into collision. Part of the change which occurred in his life, consisted in removing this exclusiveness, releasing his mind from the trammels of Judaism, and at the same time enabling him to regard not himself, for the sake of the Gospel of Christ. His individuality was turned in a new direction. Christianity now became, as it were, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. And this change subjected him to the same malign influences in his brethren, which had formerly wrought upon himself. The defection of a partisan is always a sore thrust at the heart of self. A careful perusal of the Acts

of the Apostles will, we think, make manifest the principle stated, that Jewish persecution of christianity resulted from the rebound of the selfish principle, invaded upon the side of their nationality and religion.

Let us turn now to the persecution of christianity by the Romans.

The Roman also had a peculiarly strong national feeling. In Rome the Political element was in the ascendant. The State was regarded as the realization of the highest good. The cloud-throned Zeus of the Greeks was baptized Jupiter Capitolinus. Everything in that huge, world-conquering fabric, was calculated to excite national pride and inflame the love of country. The banner under which the Roman fought, whether it flashed in the beams of the Orient, or fluttered amid the forests of Gaul, or waved over the snows of Britain, was inscribed with the initials of "Senatus, Populusque Romani." Everywhere the magic words "Romanus sum," threw around the man who uttered them an invisible armour of protection. Bound thus to the state by such strong and tender ties, an indignity offered to Rome was an indignity offered to the Roman.

The Roman has been called tolerant; and a show of facts seems to substantiate it. But a careful scrutiny will discover, that he was tolerant only when there was no call to intolerance. Roman toleration was altogether the result of circumstances. The state being regarded as the realization of the highest good, almost anything could be tolerated, which did not infringe upon this; but an infringement upon this was resented with merciless sternness. "Worship the Gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and compel all others to do the same." "Suffer no man to deny the Gods." Such was the advice of Maecenas to Augustus. "Whoever introduced new religions, the tendency and character of which were unknown, whereby the minds of men might be disturbed, should, if belonging to the higher rank, be banished; if to the lower, punished with death," was a ruling principle of civil law. Nevertheless, the Gods of other nations were conciliated; but in such a manner as that the policy of the state was not compromised. The conquered divinities were received with due honor into the Roman Capitol. Men of a thousand nations were found in Rome, quietly worshipping their own Gods according to the laws at home, when christianity claimed a resting place in the great city. This however was the condescension of the conquerors to the conquered. No Roman citizen could join in the observ-

ance of any such foreign rites, without a special decree of the Senate.

It was impossible, from the very nature of the case, that this condescending toleration should be extended to christianity. It infringed upon the idea of nationality. It did not recognize the state as the realization of the highest good. It claimed not an asylum as the religion of any nation. It came as a conqueror. It spoke of a kingdom which was not the Roman empire;—a universal kingdom, and it called upon the proud mistress of the world to bow to its sceptre. The new converts seemed to renounce their family and country that they might connect themselves in an indissoluble bond of union, with a peculiar society which every where assumed a different character from the rest of mankind. The whole body of christians unanimously refused to hold any communion with the Gods of Rome, of the empire, and of mankind. They would have nothing to do with Jupiter Capitolinus. Nothing but collision could be expected, when the professors of such a doctrine were brought face to face with the Cæsars. Nero saw at a glance, that there was something in their position, which was incompatible with his. This kingdom was an anomaly, which could not safely co-exist with his government. And the more nearly that government approached the character of a military despotism, the more fierce must the contest between it and the spiritual kingdom necessarily become. One or the other must fall. Christianity thus impinged upon the individuality of the throned Cæsar, and the percussion was felt to some extent by every one connected with the government, in proportion as he realized the position of the two antagonistic powers. One of Pliny's tests was the making of offerings to the statue of the emperor. Cyprian was beheaded "as the enemy of the Gods of Rome, and as the chief and ringleader of a criminal association, which he had seduced into an impious resistance against the laws of the most holy emperors Valerian and Gallienus." The Neronian persecution was no more an accident resulting from the burning of Rome, as Milman calls it, than the Reformation was an accident resulting from the commission of Tetzel to sell indulgences in Germany. The christians were already objects of popular and imperial hatred, and this hatred arose from deeper causes than any that could be called accidental.

The incompatibility of christianity with the dominion of the Cæsars was felt, not only by the impious and jealous Nero, but by the more humane and philosophical emperors. The humanity of Marcus Aurelius might dispose him to compassionate the

suffering christians, but his Stoicism presented no point of congeniality to the claims of christianity. In Stoicism the sense of individuality reached its climacteric; although exhibited in the anomalous form of the abnegation and annihilation of self. These after all were but manifestations of self-reliance. Marcus Aurelius felt, perhaps more than any other, the intrusion of christianity into the sanctuary of self. He persecuted with the cool self-complacency of the philosopher.

Influences leading to the same result might be traced, more or less clearly, as acting upon Trajan, and upon his governor Pliny, and upon the other persecuting emperors, especially Galerius and Dioclesian. The fifty years of repose which the christians enjoyed previous to the Dioclesian persecution, had so much increased their number and influence, as to awaken anew the Pagan mind to the danger which threatened the old institutions. The bigoted and fanatical Galerius felt this influence in all its force, and he was eager to shed the blood of the hated sect; and nothing could have moved the cautious and experienced statesman, Dioclesian, to engage in persecution, but appeals to his personal safety and honor, the fallacy of which he was not discerning enough to see. It might be shown also, that Julian's toleration did not result from the absence of these influences or his insensibility to them, but from a discriminating and worldly-wise policy. He occupied a position from which he could learn the lesson, that persecution usually fails of its object. He was far sighted enough to perceive a principle, which has now been pretty clearly visible to the civilized world generally for nearly two centuries—to which vision however the civilized world attained by the most gradual steps.

Time forbidding to pursue this particular investigation, let us consider the point of collision between christianity and the masses of the Roman world. Among the common people must the ultimate motive-power be sought, which moved the wheel of persecution in the majority of instances. The rulers were often the mere tools or instruments. They were obliged to yield to the pressure from below, and deliver over to death the followers of the Nazarene, as Pontius Pilate had their Master.

One point of collision we have already noticed—the Roman nationality. Another, when the friction was stronger than in the case of the rulers, and where the invasion of the individuality of the Roman was more galling, was on the side of his religion. The old Roman was a man of religion; and although in the Augustan age much of the ancient reverence and devotion had given way to scepticism and indifference, which were

sapping the foundations of the old superstitions, as luxury and profligacy were sapping the foundations of the empire, yet these influences were comparatively little felt in the lower strata of society. Hence the Lares and Penates were still dear as when father Anchises was carried from the flames of Troy; and christianity branded these as idle toys. The sacrifices were still thought propitiatory or pleasing to the gods, as when Æneas found the aged Evander upon the banks of the Tiber, engaged in the sacred rites of Hercules; and christianity pulled down the altars. The temples and sacred groves were still viewed as the abodes of divinity, and these christianity profaned. The Pagans contemplated with awe and reverence the gorgeous system of mythology, starting in the depths of a hoary antiquity with those superhuman heroes, who, in the infancy of the world, had invented arts, instituted laws, and vanquished the tyrants or monsters which infested the earth; and this gilded fabric christianity declared an inane phantom, and instead of these demi-gods offered a crucified Jewish malefactor. The Roman's religion was inseparably connected with outward show and pageant; the christian had none of this, and the Roman regarded him as a God-abandoned atheist. The christian contemned the superstitions of his family, his city, and his province; and he was branded as a hater of his kind. The anger of the gods might well be supposed to hang over such an impious sect; and if the Roman tolerated it, he might expect his own home to be unsettled or desolated by the earthquake or the pestilence. He felt that the rights of toleration, vague as was his apprehension of them, were forfeited by any sect who thus separated themselves from gods and men. It will be seen that here were numerous points in which the Roman individuality would be infringed on every side. To touch his religion was to touch himself.

That it was the religious principle which was invaded, is seen from the manner in which alone his ire could be appeased. The great test was to sacrifice to, or worship the gods, or blaspheme Christ. "You may obtain pardon of our emperors," said the pro-consul Saturninus to the Numidian christians, "if in good earnest you will return to our gods."

Between the philosopher, also, and christianity there was a grating point of collision. Pride of opinion and philosophic self-sufficiency could not easily succumb to the humbling doctrines of the cross. Christianity ignored the proud wisdom of the world. It proclaimed the doctrine of a spiritual, unseen Supreme Being, to be a doctrine for all men: while the aristo-

cratic few supposed themselves alone capable of elevating their minds to the contemplation of the great First Cause. Even Plato had warned them that it was "dangerous to publish the knowledge of the true God." If the religious Roman was chagrined, to find himself robbed of his alars and his Penates, and his hoary system of mythology stripped of its reality, the philosophic Roman was chagrined to find his gilded system of speculation eviscerated of its truthfulness and power. The long list of teachers of mankind, from Orpheus, to the elder Pliny, to be vanquished by the illiterate fishermen of Galilee!

Besides, christianity precisely contradicted the highest idea the Roman world had attained of an external religion. That idea was the national form of religion. Christianity proclaimed itself a religion for mankind, irrespective of all nationality. "The noblest fruit of piety," writes Porphyry to his wife, "is to worship God after the manner of one's country." "The man that can believe it possible," says Celsus, "for Greeks and Barbarians, in Asia, Europe and Lybia, to agree in one code of religious laws, must be quite void of understanding." The result, gradually becoming apparent, seemed to cast back this stigma upon the philosopher himself. Christianity unwittingly twitched the philosophic beard, and Diogenes growled from his tub.

Thus we think a point of invasion of the individuality may be traced every where, by which, amid the political, collateral and accidental influences which evolved and moulded it, was moved the deepest under current of that deluge of persecution, which greeted the infant and growing church.

Did space permit we might trace minutely the growth of the persecuting spirit in the church herself, and find there indications of the same principle we have attempted to trace elsewhere. We might speak of christianity in its first periods as a form of love; in its practical working more an outgoing and blending of the emotions than afterwards; a subversion of *particularism*, a mutual surrender to some extent, or at least a modification of the sense of individuality. We might speak of it in its succeeding periods, as especially a witness for the truth, brought into contact with forms of error, called to defend the form of sound words received from the Apostolic teachers, engaged in a warfare which called forth at once into their highest activity the sense of responsibility and of individuality. We might speak of the stern and solemn decrees of councils and synods, uttered with a voice of intensity and earnestness, as though they felt they were placed to guard the shrine of the inner temple—a voice as thrilling as that of the Stygian vates. "Procul, O, procul este, pro-

fani!" We might show how the collateral influence of the malign emotions, outworking from the injured individuality, changed the action of opposing councils into vituperation, and marred the outward victory in this holy warfare by the dark stains of persecution.

We might notice the Protestant persecutions in England; the excommunication and banishment of *Dissenters*, by the proclamation of James I; the fires of Smithfield; the bloody rule of Charles I and Laud, when Leighton was fined ten thousand pounds, pilloried, whipped, imprisoned, had his ears cut off, his nose slit and his cheek branded with the letters SS, for writing a book *against the hierarchy*; and when a book *against sports* on the Lord's day cost William Prynne, barrister, his ears and five thousand pounds. Nor might we pass over the persecuting spirit of the Presbyterians, in the days of their power; their efforts to enforce *uniformity*, and to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, &c. The Puritan individuality might furnish a fine subject for an artistic sketch. A brief reference might also be made to the persecution of Quakers, Baptists, and witches, in New England, by which the illustrious apostle of toleration was made an exile from home and country. We might dwell upon Mohammedan individuality and persecution, and upon the collision between christianity and existing systems of heathenism, as exemplified in the history of modern missions. We might cite the case of the Chinese, where we see developed simultaneously, to their highest pitches the sense of nationality and the sense of individuality, and where we find the most insuperable hostility to christianity. All this ground, however, would be quite too extensive for the limits of the present article, nor is it necessary to go over it to secure the *instantias convenientes* of Bacon.

But we cannot avoid noticing briefly the persecuting spirit of the church of Rome. The historical circumstances attendant upon and consequent from the fall of the old Roman Empire, co-operated to make Rome a great centre of ecclesiastical power. The Bishop became first the adviser and then the arbiter for the christian world. The spiritual greatness was a suitable counterpart to her ancient political greatness. During the noon-day of her dominion, extending from the pontificate of Innocent III to that of Boniface VIII inclusive, or through the 13th century, she inspired all the terror of her ancient name. She was once more the mistress of the world, and kings were her vassals. She was the arbiter of thought. Thousands, not only of stupid, passive souls, but of earnest, gifted minds, received the words

from her lips as the lively oracles of God. This position, connected with the consciousness that christianity craved after unity, begat an intense feeling of responsibility. The repository of Divine truth, the vice-gerent and high priest of God upon earth, must be also the guardian of this truth. She must not permit the sacred shrine to be profaned. The interpreter of the mind of the spirit must extinguish the false light of heretical doctrine. This position also developed to a high degree, in the church considered as a unique body, the sense of individuality. Conspicuous trust is always a sweet incense to the idol of self. She exalted herself as a queen upon the seven hills. From her there could be no appeal. Her thunders were decisive. Her utterances were oracular. The intoxication of power and the foul leaven of corruption wrought up this self-exaltation to a frantic madness; and her power was turned in a most malignant direction. The heretic must be burnt as the traducer and enemy of God, but he was burnt with a peculiar zest because he was the traducer and enemy of Rome. The reformer who carped at prevailing abuses carped at Rome herself. To assail what Rome taught as the truth of God was to impugn and assail the teacher herself. Here was room for the influx of all the malign emotions which the most zealous Protestant could desire, to insure the identity of Antichrist, and for all the Satanic agency necessary to complete the picture of him, "whose coming is after the working of Satan." A striking characteristic of Antichrist is an abnormal development of the selfish principle. "He exalteth *himself* above all that is called God or that is worshipped."

As political Rome nurtured to its full growth the national feeling, and took up in it and secured the service of the individual feeling, so spiritual Rome nurtured the Church feeling, considered as the feeling of party, and thus enlisted the individual feeling by fastening her hold upon the religious susceptibilities. Her agencies and tactics for this purpose display an almost superhuman skill. Never before nor since has the world seen such willing, faithful and effective servants of a great central power. "If I forget thee, O Society of Jesus," exclaimed Xavier in India, "let my right hand forget her cunning." Rome thus secured everywhere multitudes of willing minds, and ready hands, to accomplish her purposes. It is idle to think of securing such unswerving fealty in any cause, without enlisting the individuality. Disobedience or insult to Rome grated irritatingly upon thousands of devoted and jealous hearts, and multitudes of injured vassals stood ready with fire and faggot,

awaiting her nod, to avenge the wrong. And then, besides this strong fealty, the individuality of every zealous Romanist was enlisted in behalf of the Roman teachings, as part of his own mental wealth. No matter how gratuitously a man may receive his opinions, he does not fail to regard and defend them as his own.

Thus we think the workings of the selfish principle, grasped and distorted upon the side of the religious nature, may be traced with more than ordinary clearness in the persecuting spirit of that Church which commissioned Dominic and Manfort to butcher the Albigenses, compelled Galileo to deny that the world turned round, shut out for weary years the free air of heaven from the pious Gotteschalc in the dungeons of France, burned Huss and dug up the bones of Wickliffe.

We have not contended that the principle proposed accomplishes everything. As premised in the early part of this article, the collateral influences may almost hide it from view. All we assert is that it is one always present principle. Nor, when speaking of those who have cherished the persecuting spirit, have we intended that they should be invariably regarded as monsters of depravity. We have contended, that persecution is only the *abuse* of a right principle; and this, we think, derives strong confirmatory proof from the character of some of those who have practised it. Whilst it is true that a signal abuse of such a principle, through the influx of the malign emotions, is likely to be, and has been, connected with great moral deformity in every view, yet it is on the other hand an indisputable fact, that some of the best of men have sanctioned the punishment of errors in opinion. Many a ghastly president of the Inquisition, whose face told of intense mental conflict, and from whose sunken eye shot forth an unearthly glare, was a man who slept five hours and prayed seven! Even the lovely Pascal was an advocate for the principle, that "heretics should be punished by the civil power;" and a suspicious stain rests upon the victorious escutcheon of the great Genevan himself.

Persecution in its bloody forms has long been unknown in the christian world. Why is this? Not because the sense of individuality is wanting, or less strong than ever, but because it is turned in new directions. The collateral influences are wanting to turn it into its old channels. The influences calculated to counteract and repress the malign emotions, and broader views of man's relations, growing out of the general state of the world and of christianity, are strong enough to prevent the grosser outbreaks of persecution. It may have assumed subtler forms,

and an unexpected change of circumstances might develop its old phenomena; but we cannot help thinking that now, more than ever before, the true principle in both its aspects has rooted itself in the consciousness of mankind,—the abuse separated from the use. So may it ever be!

II. The second general aspect in which we purpose to view Persecution is in its *influence upon the church*. We shall confine ourselves to persecution as *suffered* by the Church,—we take it for granted that a persecuting spirit, overleaping the limits of a legitimate defence of the faith, in the Church can only be deleterious.

The aphorism of Tertullian, that “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church,” has come down to us with the venerable sanctity of a proverb; and it has the more claim to regard, as being a voice from the very midst of persecution itself:—the exclamation of a man, who saw the results which followed in its devastating track. The proverb doubtless contains an important and significant truth, but it needs limitation and explanation. It is only at certain times, and under certain circumstances, that persecution could possibly exert a salutary influence upon the Church. To a pure Church, or a Church so situated as to be unable to scatter abroad among unconverted nations; or to a Church whose special vocation at any particular time required undisturbed unity of action, and calm, thoughtful repose, persecution could be of no conceivable benefit, but must prove terribly disastrous. But believing that God is in history as well as in nature, and that He controls the phenomena of mind as well as of matter, we may assure ourselves that upon such a Church her great Head will never allow the hand of persecution to be laid. Persecution can only be beneficial to a *corrupt*, or an *inactive* Church;—to a Church which needs *purification* or *dispersion*.

Persecution then we would call a *necessary evil*. We call it an *evil*, because it is attended with trial and suffering, and actual loss of life to the Church. And we call it a *necessary* evil, because, owing to the present fallen state of the world, and corresponding imperfect state of the Church, it is required at certain times, to enable the Church to attain the final end of her mission. That there is such a class of necessary evils will hardly be doubted; and their existence is an enigma which forms but one phase of the great enigma of the presence of evil in the world. A severe, prostrating sickness is an evil, *per se*, but it may be demanded in certain states of the system, to purify and re-invigorate it. The amputation of a diseased limb is an evil,

per se, but it may be necessary in order to save life. The existence of prisons and penitentiaries and gallows is a very bad thing; but the sanctity of the law, and the safety of society, demand them. To say that these things, on account of their ultimate good, are not evils but blessings, is mere quibbling, trifles with the intuitions of consciousness, and if carried out destroys the moral distinction between right and wrong.

The history of the Christian Church, during the first three centuries of its existence, as it has furnished us the facts in testing the principle proposed, so it furnishes a fair instance of the necessity and legitimate influence of persecution, under the providence of God. Let us examine the benefits which resulted from it.

1. It was beneficial for *purifying* the Church. Just think, for one moment, of the elements from which the Church must form itself. It was planted down amidst the debasement and blindness of heathenism; and at a time when the Roman Empire, though outwardly dazzling and prosperous, was festering with the loathsome corruption which hastened its fall. The Apostle Paul, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, gives us a graphic and startling picture of the general state of the heathen world, with special reference to Rome, and the pages of Tacitus and his contemporaries fully confirm its truthfulness. The ancient age of sterling human virtue had passed, and an age of luxurious effeminacy and gilded rottenness had succeeded.

“She saw her glories star by star expire.”

A former age had witnessed the deification of Concord and Faith and Modesty. Venus Verticordia presided over the purity of domestic morals, and the most virtuous woman in Rome was chosen to dedicate her statue. But now the worship of the heart had ceased to sanctify these impersonations of human virtues, the moral tone of society was relaxed, and the deities became cold abstractions. Even the sacred rites became defiled with unspeakable pollutions. Besides the popular system had lost its hold upon the educated mind. The golden age of imagination, in which the awe-struck mind listened with trembling belief to the wildest fables, and lived in the deep feeling of the sublime and the beautiful, had yielded to an iron age of reason. The deities of poetry humanized had lost all worship of the heart, among the unbelieving aristocracy. Philosophy had proposed to refine the popular religion into a more rational creed, if not to offer itself as a substitute. “The popular religions of

antiquity," says Neander, "answered only for a certain stage of culture. When the nations in the course of their progress had passed beyond this, the necessary consequence was a dis severing of the spirit from the religious traditions." "The world," says D'Aubigne, "was tottering on its old foundations, when christianity appeared. The various religions which had sufficed for an earlier age, no longer satisfied the nations. The mind of the existing generation could no longer tabernacle in the ancient forms. The gods of the nations had lost their oracles—as the nations had lost their liberty in Rome. Brought face to face in the Capitol, they had mutually destroyed the illusion of their divinity. A vast void had ensued in the religious opinions of mankind." Claiming, as the Church did, to fill the void, bearing the highest hopes and spiritual inducements for man, it would have been a miracle, had there been no restraining check, if multitudes had not sought a place within her pale, who only covered the hideous corse of Paganism with the garb of christianity. Such a check was furnished by the impingement of christianity upon the heathen mind, and the results that followed. Persecution was thus a *sifting* or *winnowing* process to separate the chaff from the wheat, and save christianity from a total divestiture of its distinctive character. With all the checks and safeguards thrown around it, the religion of Christ could not remain intact in its conflict with the religions of man; without these—had it assumed a position of quiet cohabitation—we see not how it could have retained its peculiarities and its power. The perilous tendency to deterioration showed itself strongly, after the fires of persecution had been finally extinguished. The Pagan party became strong in the Church. The wise and thoughtful Gregory of Nazianzen writes, at the beginning of Julian's reign, that "the Church had more to fear from its enemies within than from those without." And in fact the partial triumph of Julian was possible, only because the Pagan party had gathered such alarming strength in the bosom of the Church. The blind zeal of Constantius, which led him beyond the true limit in his efforts to suppress paganism and establish christianity, had caused many to assume hypocritically the profession of christianity, while at heart they were still inclined to paganism. In order to retain favor at court, they were willing to exchange a few pagan for christian names, from which position a retreat back to paganism would be easy when the time for reaction came. We repeat it, the persecution of the first three centuries was necessary to save the Church.

2. It was beneficial for the *spread* of the Church: i. e. the

increase of *true* believers. We are told that when the persecution arose about Stephen, the christians were scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, and travelled as far as Phenice and Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the word, and that a great multitude believed and turned unto the Lord. Doubtless this stringent agency was necessary, to break the force of local attachments, which kept the body of the disciples in the neighborhood of the holy city. The time having come that christianity should burst the bonds of Jewish exclusiveness, it was of great advantage that the divine leaven should begin to work simultaneously at many points, in the Gentile world. This result the persecution which Stephen elicited effected, as the tempest scatters over a continent the seed which otherwise would fall around the root of the parent stock. Similar was the effect of the Roman persecutions, especially that of Dioclesian. Thousands of christians took refuge in the neighboring barbarian tribes, and in some cases left results behind them, which told upon the entire future history of the Church. A similar event has occurred in modern times. We refer to the landing of the pilgrims at the rock of Plymouth! This dispersive agency indeed seems to have been one of those much employed by Providence, in the administration of the Church. Human instruments must be operated upon by motives, which appeal to human susceptibilities. The Israelites had to be prepared for a cheerful exodus from Egypt, by the severity of their task-masters.

And the scenes of martyrdom themselves, while they drove pseudo-christians out of the Church, and deterred hypocrites from entering it, operated powerfully upon the bystanders, to lead them to a just and true appreciation of and sympathy for christianity, and by the Holy Spirit were made a means of opening the eyes of many to their need of salvation. A martyr, whether in a good or a bad cause, always carries power in his agonies to reflecting minds; and this mainly because of the spontaneous conviction, so natural to the mind, that nothing but truth can bear up the spirit of martyrdom to the final issue. That the number of true christians increased under persecution, we have the express testimony, not only of the too extravagant Tertullian, but of Basil of Cesarea and others of the early fathers.

3. Persecution was beneficial, in *drawing forth the resources* of the Church. It is a well known principle in human nature, that opposition stimulates to greater exertion, and that great and critical emergencies are necessary, to develop the highest strength

of character. A certain amount of pressure is required, in order to bring all the energies of the man into actual operation. Placed as we are in the midst of a world, where the action must perpetually be adapted to the time and the circumstances, this characteristic seems inseparable from the conditions of our human existence. Our natures might be likened to the famous bridge, on which the conquering Roman passed the Rhine; the harder the current presses, the more firmly, within certain limits, are the joints knit in resistance. There is no reason, why this principle should not have all its force in the sphere of religion. The same conditions surround us here as everywhere else; and the energy aroused is the more intense, because of the vital nature of that of which opposition would rob us. Perhaps no man prizes his religion sufficiently, until called to part with it. To make him so prize it, is the effect of persecution. The true christian's religion then becomes a thing of stern and strong reality, and he clings to it with invincible tenacity. Then, too, as in every other sphere, does the emergency develop striking instances of individual character. That great men are the product of the age, is a truth often uttered in these latter days. Circumstances do much in the formation of character. It were hard to make expert sailors, did storms never toss the billows and howl through the masts. In times of persecution, strong and fearless spirits rise up to serve as beacons for the agonizing Church. A type of character is then developed, which it would be impossible to produce amid the luxury of repose. Mariners tell us of a bird, the petrel, whose wild shriek is heard only amid the roar of the storm. So, *mutatis mutandis*, in the storm of persecution, the voice of the master spirits of the Church is heard to comfort and cheer. Such were the noble Bishop Martyrs, and the staunch and intrepid Apologists of the early Church. Besides, we must make large account for the special presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, at such times of her history. It is precisely in accordance with the promises of God's word, and the plan of God's dealings with her. A purifying and recuperative process is only indicative of his careful affection for her. Though she must be purged, she must never perish. While he afflicts with one hand, he upholds with the other. When the three men were cast into the burning fiery furnace, the form of one like to the Son of God was seen walking with them through its midst. God's promise to the typical Jacob has received its deepest verification, in the history of the Church: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee;

when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy one of Israel thy Saviour." (Is. 43 : 2)

But here we are met with the evasion, that *any sect will grow under persecution* ; and that consequently the evidence in behalf of christianity, derived from its history, is of no avail. On this premise then, it would seem that all that is necessary to make any form of opinion universally prevalent, is to persecute it effectually. But this bears absurdity upon its very face. It is impossible, that the incidental circumstance of persecution should give anything a permanent dominion over the human mind, which contained no inherent principle of power. It were as rational to suppose, that exciting stimulants could serve as a permanent substitute for a healthy stomach. Persecution may excite a temporary, spasmodic strength, even where the inherent power is feeble, but it can never serve as a substitute for inherent life and power. Because a certain plant gains vigor by being trampled upon, it were a fallacy fatal to gardeners to conclude that trampling would insure the healthy growth of all plants. No man will long suffer for false doctrine. Falsehood begets no sustaining enthusiasm, prolific of martyrs. Deists may have been disfranchised, or atheists guillotined ; but deism or atheism has little power of compensation for such sacrifices, and rarely reaps a harvest from such martyr blood. Positive faith only is bold, uncompromising and aggressive ; negative faith is cowering, cunning and insinuating. Besides, the premise assumed is refuted by the facts of history. It is not true, that every persecuted sect has flourished, even though it may have embodied a faith to some extent positive. Sects have been checked, abated, and extinguished, by persecution. Witness the extinction of the Donatist sect, in the sixth century, under the strong hand of Gregory the Great ; and the fatal blows dealt to the Albigenses by the crusades of Rome. In France, where Protestantism has been most persecuted, Protestantism has made least progress. The history of Protestantism in France is marked with blood. Nowhere did it so often have its dwelling in dungeons ; nowhere did it so often give its testimony from the scaffold ; nowhere did it bear so marked a resemblance to the christianity of the first ages in faith and love, and in the number of its martyrs ; and yet its conquests in France have been meagre. The country of St. Bartholomew's eve, of the atrocities of Charles IX and Louis XIV, is this day in the rear of Protestant advancement.

The fact is, the assertion that any sect will grow under perse-

cution possesses only the shadow of truth. While persecution stimulates and draws forth the resources of any sect, it adds no new elements; and the sect that possesses not the vigor and inherent strength, to rebound under the pressure, must be crushed. The projectile power of a bow is in proportion to its tension, but if too strong an arm siezes it, it must break. Repeated storms cause the oak to root more firmly in the earth, but if a tornado comes, it must be uprooted. The possession of inherent power is pre-requisite, in order to derive benefit from persecution. It was only because christianity possessed such power, carried in its bosom the mighty truth of God, that it survived and grew amid the storms which pressed upon it. The mere stimulant of persecution, galvanizing the lifeless corse of falsehood, were a paltry source from which to evolve the world-moving issues of christianity. On merely human principles, the Church must have been crushed at more than one time in her history but like Israel she survived because the Lord in the midst of her is mighty.

We have thus seen some of the benefits of persecution to the Church. On the other hand it must be admitted, it is attended with many evils, just as sickness is attended with sore temptations. If persecution is a necessary evil, it follows, that it merely furnishes, in smaller evils, a refuge from greater. Times of persecution are generative of the spirit of *fanaticism*. The most insinuating enemy of the martyr, is spiritual pride. He is likely to come to look upon his endurance of persecution as a virtue, and hence to court it by reckless daring. The fanatical spirit has never been entirely absent from the periods of the Church's tribulation. Many in the primitive persecutions eagerly confronted the executors of the law, and courted the embrace of the flames. Fanaticism may exhibit itself in suffering as well as in action. Religion in such times is also in danger of losing its spirit of *gentleness* and *charity*, and becoming stern and bitter, full of invective and denunciation. True such was rarely the character of the expressions which were uttered from the scaffold or the stake; but such was the general character induced upon the Church. It is difficult in the privacy of retirement to preserve a calm and charitable mind, under the goading stings of persecution. The very reaction of the mind, under the pressure of persecution, by which it is made beneficial, must induce a certain degree of pugnacity. Again, persecution is prone to make religion *one-sided*. It becomes a thing of one idea. Its character as a *life*, working out fruitfully in all directions, is subordinated, and it becomes pre-eminently a *power*,

exhibited in the heroic endurance of pain. In the very nature of the case, its force must be spent principally in one direction. Just as continued sickness would prevent the growth and activity of the body, so incessant persecution would ruin the Church. She must have her seasons of calm, healthful, undisturbed growth and development. Whilst the winter may root her more firmly in the earth, the summer must cover her with foliage and fruit.

Chambersburg, Pa.

J. C.

THE SYNERGISTIC LAWS OF SPIRITUAL LIFE IN MAN.

WHEN our Lord cursed the fruitless fig-tree, his disciples doubtless knew that his word was power, and would work some striking effect; but the next morning they marvelled that the fig-tree had withered away. Whereupon he states to them the law of divine and human co-operation in the spiritual kingdom:

"Have faith in God; for verily I say unto you, that whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed and be thou cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart but shall believe that those things which he saith shall come to pass, he shall have whatsoever he saith. Therefore I say unto you, What things soever ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them," Mark xi: 22ff.

The views of the disciples in accordance with this teaching appear in their exercise of miraculous power after the ascension of Christ, and in their doctrine of the efficacy of believing prayer in general.

For our present purpose it does not concern us to decide whether the Saviour refers to the power of working miracles alone, or to the power of spiritual works in general; for we now take the case simply to illustrate the law of the united agencies of God and man in all the spiritual works of believers, whether miraculous or otherwise.

In the case of the fig-tree, as in every other miracle of Christ, there was an act of divine power at the will of the man Jesus. So the fact appeared to the disciples, and so it really was; for thus alone would the case suggest the law which the Saviour thereupon declared. Now that in miracles, the relation of divine power to the human will was the same in the case of Jesus and in that of the disciples, sufficiently appears from the words, He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also; and from the kind of agreement between them and him in the manner of working miracles. And that in the ordinary spiritual acts of Jesus and those of his people, the relation of divine power to the human will may be considered the same in him and in them, is clear from his life being given as their example.

We therefore first inquire into the prevailing relation between divine power and the human will in Jesus Christ.

The reader will see, that our course of thought has no eye whatever to the question of two wills in Christ; but only assumes that whatever of distinctive human will was given in

him bore a uniform and assignable relation to acts of divine power; and it is with that relation only that we now have to do.

On the part of Jesus, the general relation of the will to divine power and authority as personally represented in the Father, was that of implicit and unvarying submission. So prominent was this constitutional trait of the Mediator, even before the *actual* embodiment in the flesh, that it impressed its future form upon the mind of prophecy, and described itself in the obedient declaration, *Lo, I come—to do thy will, O God.* In the actual incarnation, we hear the same voice of submission continually:—*I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.* My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight. If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not my will but thine be done. And this commendation of his submission is carried out by the apostle, who says, that Christ became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. In this submission of Jesus, is found the condition which placed his will in its effective relation to the divine power.

We next observe, that this will of Jesus, in its own sphere, held to the divine power the relation of direction or control. We see him while yet a child, before the doctors in the temple, calling into his service, at his own volition, a superhuman power of knowledge and of utterance, which filled his hearers with astonishment at his understanding and answers. During the forty days temptation in the wilderness, the voluntary fasting was a temporary transfer of his bodily life from the natural supports to the keeping of the divine power, then at his command for that end. He walks on the water, in the exercise of a will, which, at once, originates and guides his bodily motions, and at the same time, either upholds his body without solid support, or makes the water a solid under his feet. In his acts of healing and of resurrection, the divine power waits on his word, which is to command the sick and the lame to rise, and the dead to come forth; or on the motion of his finger, which touches the tongue of the dumb, the ears of the deaf, and the eyes of the blind, as the signal of his will to cure. In the scene of the transfiguration, his body becomes resplendent at his will, and at his will resumes its natural state. When he breathes on his disciples, and says, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*, and when he sends them out to work miracles in his name, he gives them, at will, the same power by which he spoke and acted; and in every way, as occasions arise, gives clear proof that his will has such command of divine power, as the will of the natural man has of certain powers of the body and the mind.

There were involuntary effects of the personal agency of Christ, which we notice here as proof that the superhuman forces, in the midst of which he did his voluntary acts, were not all compressed into the narrow sphere of the human will. We call them involuntary, because connected with no manifest, and probably no conscious act of human volition. Of this sort were the motions of the people towards him, so far as they were governed by impressions of his divinity and messiahship. The feeling of the common people who heard him gladly, and glorified God, bore unquestionable marks of what we now call an involuntary divine influence from Christ. A cripple at the pool, who had not been abroad to catch the epidemic fervor, shows indeed no peculiar interest in his presence; but the blind men, who had received upon their religious instincts the impressions of his fame, cry out to him as he passes by, O Lord, thou Son of David, have mercy upon us. A person possessed comes up to him, exclaiming, I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God. And evil spirits come out of many, crying out and saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of God. A person in the throng presses timidly towards him to touch the hem of his garment, saying in herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole. To these and similar mental impressions should be added, effects on the bodies of the sick, in the same sense involuntary. The person who touched his garment drew from him a virtue, which healed her infirmity, without a specific and manifest act of volition from him. In one of the places where the people thronged him with their sick, there went virtue out of him and healed them all. If the forty days fasting, the walking on the water, and other like miracles, should by any reader be excluded from the class of divine works done at the manifest instance of the human will, they would fall in here.

The voluntary miracles illustrate the free command of the human will in Jesus, over phenomena which rest solely on divine power as their efficient cause; the involuntary show that this human will, in its free command over these acts of divine power, is itself immersed continually in an atmosphere of supernatural energy.

The metaphysical explanation of these phenomena is, with man, impossible. The theological explanation is this: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very work's sake." "I can of mine own self

do nothing." "I by the Spirit of God cast out devils." "Thou, Father art in me, and I in thee." In other words, the eternal Son is made flesh in the man Jesus; and the Father in his supremacy, and the Spirit in his energy, are inseparable from the Son. Both still dwell in him. And out of this union of God and man in Christ, arises what we have above stated as the synergistic law of the divine and human operation in Christ. By this law the human will takes conditional command of divine power, and controls an efficient agency in works which lie wholly beyond the sphere of mere humanity. At the same time is this will itself subjected continually to the sway of that supernatural energy, with whose motions it thus freely joins its own acts.

In Christ, the second Adam, humanity re-appears in that union with God which had been lost in the first. In him we look for the example of true spiritual life, both as to its inward constitution and its outward form. In him the life is given in its principle as purely divine, and not an extract or an accident of fallen humanity, in the laws of its action in man, and in the form of its exercises and its fruits.

We next consider the corresponding acts of the disciples, as indicating the relation of the human will to divine power in them.

And on their part again appears the preliminary submission, which we observed in Jesus. They forsake all to follow him, they receive his teachings with the uniform deference of sincere disciples; they go and come at his bidding; they take his word as security for success in their unprecedented mission; they confess his name as the source and the signal of their power. Their unqualified submission proved its depth and sincerity in their devotion first to his person during his visible presence with them, then to his work after his ascension. Its crowning manifestation was their steadfast adherence to him, after his departure, as the God of their trust and their worship.

The exception of an individual among them, to whom a part of this description will not apply, is connected with a corresponding exception as to his works. The partial submission, which went only to the outward sphere of the physical miracle, and stopped short of the intimate sphere of the ethical, was still a steadfast submission to the faith in the miracle working power, and thus a qualification *quo ad hoc*.

In this condition of submission, the will of the disciples like that of Jesus, held to the divine relation of direction and control. In all respects relating to our present view, the disci-

ples proceeded, in miracles, exactly in the manner of Jesus. There was no more appearance of waiting for spiritual motions in them, than in him; no more sign of a conscious inability to command the divine power at their pleasure. Peter, with the cripple at the gate of the temple, speaks of the power of healing as something which he had to give; as one might have silver and gold. The miracles of healing the sick and raising the dead were wrought, whenever the apostles, at their own option, called the divine energy into action. When their occasions require, they detect falsehood and imposture by virtue of a superhuman penetration. Ananias and Sapphira are struck dead, and Elymas, the sorcerer, is struck blind, at their word. In the inspiration by which the apostles and the christian prophets had a supernatural apprehension of spiritual things, they exercised an optional command of such discernment as their occasions called for; perceiving, as by elective will, or the natural laws of suggestion, such appropriate items of divine knowledge as made their words always in season. The gift of supernatural discernment and speech by the Holy Spirit was conferred and withheld at the pleasure of the apostles; while the grand fact which presents our point in firm proof and clear light, is the possession of spiritual gifts in such diversity and profusion by the christians;—all to be regulated in their use, by the sense of order and propriety among the brethren, and under the declared law that “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets.”

At the same time this voluntary command of divine power was comprehended, as in the case of Jesus, in an atmosphere of supernatural energy, diffused through the sphere of the human presence, without particular control by the volitions of the men. Thus handkerchiefs or aprons were brought from the body of Paul to the sick, “and the diseases departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them.” A soothsaying damsel at Philippi followed the disciples many days exclaiming, These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation. The Lord opened the heart of one, softened the temper of another, and conciliated the respectful attentions and liberal kindness of others, who fell under the personal influence of the apostle Paul. In the prison at Philippi, the doors of the prison are opened at midnight, and the prisoners are unbound, and no prisoner attempts to escape. All that spiritual influence which attended the preaching of the apostles, and their miracles, and their intercourse with the people, and which caused the word of God “so mightily to grow and prevail,” belongs to the class of involuntary effects of the personal presence and activity of the disciples as agents in dispensing heavenly power.

The voluntary miracles of the apostles, like those of Jesus, prove a free command of the human will in them over operations of divine power; the involuntary show that this human will, in its free command over these divine motions, is itself comprehended in an atmosphere of supernatural energy.

Of these phenomena, as of those of Jesus, we have no metaphysical explanation. Their theological conditions are these: "Lo, I am with you always" "I in them, and thou in me." "As thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him." "Know ye not of your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" "The glory which thou gavest me I have given unto them." "He that believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father."

These words signify *first*, that God with his power over all things was in those disciples as he is in Christ, and submitted his power conditionally to their will, as he submitted his power to the human will in Jesus. He so surrenders himself to the conditions of humanity in them as to allow his own personal and peculiar energy to obey their volitions, as it obeyed the human volitions of Jesus, and as the hand of the natural body obeys the will of the mind.

The words *further* signify, that God, who, in the eternal Son, became immediately united with humanity in the person of Christ, is united mediately through Christ with the persons of his disciples. In him the divine power is joined immediately to personal humanity; in them it becomes a personal constituent through his mediation. The facts in the one case form the decisive example of the immediate union of God and man *in* Christ; the facts in the other case form an equally clear example of the mediated union of God with his people *through* Christ. Now it is the constituted subordination of divine power to the human will which forms to us the intelligible sign of single personality in Christ, and represents to us the reality of the manifestation of God *in* the flesh. Without this we could not understand that the Word was really made flesh. The divine nature having now, in the person of the Son, assumed its connexion with humanity, and revealed the relation which it condescends to hold to the personal agency of man, the way is prepared to extend this relation, through the medium of the person thus formed, to those who shall be heirs of salvation. The way of producing this union of divine power with the people of

God, is by the actual indwelling of Christ in them. Christ is formed in them;—lives in them;—dwells in them; and this is the language in which the scriptures describe the application of divine power in the acts of the spiritual life. “No man cometh to the Father but by me;” says Christ himself; and this doctrine of the mediated presence of God with his people the apostles maintain in their assertions, that through Christ we have access to the Father. Christ joins God and man in himself; then with his complex nature becomes the life of his people; doing in them, and through their free and personal agency, what he did in his separate and personal life as a manifestation of God in the flesh. With God then united to the humanity in Christ, with the divine power in him subjected, under certain conditions and in certain matters, to the human will; and then, with Christ, the first born of every creature, the first formed spiritual man, the principle, the model, the embodied power of the new life of man, so reproduced in his people, so concorporate with them, as to bring forth in them and through them, such works as he first wrought in his separate person without them;—we have the mysterious and adorable constitution of the new creation in Christ. And in this constitution we clearly discern, as an essential and unchangeable feature, an optional control of divine acts by the human will;—natural freedom in the use of supernatural power.

This natural freedom in the use of supernatural power we witness in the miraculous works of Christ, and in the similar works of his disciples, which originated from his presence and power in them. We may distinguish these miraculous works as physical phenomena of the spiritual life. They are more striking than the ethical,* because impressions from the supernatural changes of sensible things receive powerful aid through the senses. We more readily perceive in them the difference between the natural and the supernatural. Of the ethical phenomena of human nature, we distinguish with more difficulty those which are spiritual from those which are merely natural. But knowing from the scriptures that all holy acts and affections in man are effects of divine power, and that these holy acts and affections are required by authority and rewarded as virtue, we trace the same relation of divine power to the human will in the common works of the christian life as in the miracles of Christ and the apostles.

* The term ethical is here used to distinguish only the effects of the volition; with no reference whatever to the quality of the volition itself.

Of this relation of divine power to the ethical volitions of human nature, the invariable prerequisite is that same submission which was given as the condition of divine co-operation in miracles. "If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will and it shall be done unto you." "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's commandments and abide in his love." "Have faith in God." The faith required in the last of these directions is the submission and obedience supposed in the other two. It is the disposition to say, I come to do thy will; My meat is to do the will of God; Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? It is the consent of the soul to the divine requirements; acquiescence in the motions of the Spirit, already given as signs of the divine will, and as impulsive guides for the will of the man. The whole complex of this mental state is expressed by the term faith, because in this consent or acquiescence, the leading exercise of the mind is that faith which holds a lively and steady apprehension of God as the fountain of power for human redemption, and the head of authority for human obedience.

Of the origin of this faith we have decisive instruction. It is God that deals to every man the measure of faith; and he is said to give to one, by the Spirit, the word of wisdom, to another faith by the same Spirit. The faith originates in the divine power. It is a fruit of the Spirit. And the supernatural power in the support and increase of this faith is so subordinated to the voluntary motions of the soul, that the exercise of the faith itself, like all its ethical concomitants which are to be sought by self-direction and discipline, is enjoined by authority and maintained by conscious endeavor for that end.

The beginning of faith arises out of the act of Christ, by which he begins his residence and the operation of the Spirit in the soul. By this the voluntary exercises are brought at once into such an agreement with the presence of Christ and the motions of his Spirit, that the instant determination of the mind is towards the act of faith. And thenceforward, the will continues its submission to the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus now reigning within, while at the same time it occasions, by its own determination, such acts of divine power as result in the other appropriate phenomena of the spiritual life.

The husbandman learns from his own experience or that of others, the properties of his soil and the laws of its production, and also the nature of his seed, and the laws of its vegetation. He begins his agriculture by submission to the laws he has thus ascertained, making them his guide in tillage, and in fixing the

time and manner of sowing his seed, and by his voluntary agency, always maintained in this posture of submission, he directs the operation of natural powers without which his agriculture could do nothing. The spiritual man comes under the law of his proper life by the indwelling of Christ, and the work of his Spirit, and this submission to the law of life in Christ is faith. It is acquired, not as the faith of the husbandman, by experience or observation, but by the work of the Spirit of Christ who dwells in him. In this state of submission to the laws of life in Christ, he directs by his voluntary agency the acts of a supernatural power, without which he could do nothing.

All things are now ready for the process of spiritual culture by divine power, under the conduct of the human will. The spiritual man is not sufficient to do any thing of himself, but with the sufficiency of God, he can do all things. For all true knowledge he is dependent on the Holy Spirit; and yet by the study of the word of God, by the devout exercise of his thoughts upon the heavenly mysteries, by prayer, by all the natural helps of mental activity amidst the doctrines of Christ, he can increase his knowledge at pleasure. All true christian love is a fruit of the Spirit, and is so in the strictest sense; yet by guarding, in obedience to the laws of our moral nature, against vicious influence, and by the habitual and active contemplation of the things which are pure, honest, lovely and of good report, the believer accomplishes a voluntary growth in the spiritual grace of love. The discipline of our salvation is carried on by this submission of divine power to the conditional command of the personal will in man; and thus, with fear and trembling, that is, with that reverential and submissive sense of the divine presence and power, which is the true form of faith, we work out our own salvation, while it is God that worketh in us to will and to do of his good pleasure.

In this view of the divine and human agencies united in the spiritual life of man, the questions relating to divine sovereignty and human freedom, are resolved into questions of fact to be settled by history. From the earthly history of our Lord, and the miracles of his apostles, the settled facts are these: First, the submission of the human will to the divine in the acts of faith, then, the command of the human will over divine power in the acts of freedom. The freedom is seen in both the submission and the command. Matthew was called from the receipt of custom to follow Christ, and obeyed. The young ruler was required to sell his estates and to follow Christ, and did not obey. Now, while no one can deny, that the divine impulse which pre-

disposed the will of Matthew to obedience, whether that impulse was conveyed through a long course of antecedent events in the history of the man, or by an instantaneous act, was directed by sovereignty, it is also undeniable that the compliance of Matthew and the non-compliance of the ruler were alike voluntary. When Matthew has yielded to the guidance of faith, and is prepared to receive from Jesus the promise of miraculous power and to rest implicitly upon it, he takes command of the power of miracles, and he finds that power at his disposal, as occasions arise, whenever he complies with the conditions.

The submission and the command are thus historically established in relation to miracles. Then, having established this relation of the divine and human agencies to one another in working miracles, it will be, in the common views of christian people, an argument from the greater to the less, to conclude that the law which thus holds in miracles prevails in the ordinary acts of the spiritual life. Add to this the doctrines taught by the apostles and the precepts enjoined by them, which show that in their judgment the whole work of christian discipline depends on this law, and the mutual relation of the divine and human agencies in this course of discipline becomes fully established.

The train of thought above presented begins with our Lord Jesus Christ,—the original and model of dependence and freedom in the spiritual life of humanity,—and follows that constitution of the new creature in its propagation in the church. If it offers any facility in clearing, and consequently reconciling, the views of Christians concerning dependence and freedom, and in maintaining the consistency and truth of the Calvinistic exhibition of this subject, it will commend itself to the reader as one theological argument among many in which illustration serves for proof.

N. M. S.

THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

WE find in the last number of the Princeton Repertory a long article on Ursinus and the Heidelberg Catechism, (attributed to the pen of the Rev. Dr. Proudfit of New Brunswick,) in which we are called to account, not in the sweetest tone imaginable, for our article on the distinguished author of this formulary, which appears as an Introduction to Williard's translation of his Commentary on the Catechism, and which was published also in a late number of the Mercersburg Review. To make out a more full and ample case, reference is had also to our small volume, published some years since, under the title of the "History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism," as well as to the first and second of our recent articles on "Early Christianity."

First comes the unfortunate tail of the 80th question; a point, hardly entitled, in our opinion, to half a dozen pages of grave discussion in an ostensibly scientific review, and of which in the end just nothing at all is made for the reviewer's main purpose. The only show of advantage he may seem to have against us, (and it is but a thin show at best,) is found in some slight discrepancy there is, between our statement of the matter in 1847 and the representation we have made of it in 1851; this too concerning a single doubtful historical particular merely, and not changing the substance of the principal fact. In 1851 we say, of the tail of the 80th question, that it formed no part of the original Catechism as published under the hand of Ursinus himself; that it is wanting in the first two editions; and that it "was afterwards foisted in, only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast, we are told, for certain severe declarations the other way, which had been passed a short time before by the Council of Trent." Dr. Proudfit has no historical authority to urge in opposition to this statement. But on turning to our own book published in 1847, he finds the same statement in relation to the tail of the question, namely that it did not appear before the third edition, but along with this an intimation that the whole question was wanting in the first edition; while it is added, that the Elector took pains afterwards, in view of the decrees passed by the Council of Trent, "to have the question restored in full to the form in which it was originally composed," allowing the previous text to go out of use as "*defective and incorrect*." That this representation differs some from the other, is at once evident enough. The reviewer allows, that it may be accounted for by a change

of view in regard to what was the actual state of the case, between the dates of the two statements; but goes on immediately to say, that the *progress* from the statement of 1847 to that of 1851 has been in the direction of error and not of truth; mumbling something about our having failed to explain the variation in the later version, and with no small indelicacy insinuating a charge of direct dishonesty in the whole business. The man who talks in this way, may well be held somewhat sternly to the strict proof of what he says. "We shall convince the reader," writes Dr. Proudfit, "that his progress in this respect, (we fear in others too,) has been in the direction of error and not of truth." This means, if it mean anything at all, that the light in which the point in hand is presented by us in 1847, is nearer the truth than the view taken of it in 1851. But now what is the evidence brought to uphold this assertion? We have looked for it with some interest; and at first expected indeed, (from the confident tone of the critic,) that our own former impression was about to be justified again by some proof, better than any we had been able to find for it when writing our later sketch. But we are constrained to say, that we have been altogether disappointed. Not a word is quoted from any authority, which is of any real force, to show that the 80th question "was contained in the original draft as written by Ursinus," or that the third edition restored here simply what had been omitted in the first and second. The only show of evidence for any such supposition, (beyond our own mistaken statement in 1847,) is found in a single word of the notice to the Christian Reader appended, as Niemeyer says, to both the second and third editions: "*Was im ersten truck übersehen wird, als fürnemlich folio 55, ist jetzunder auss befelch Churfürstlicher Gnaden addiert worden.*"¹ The proof is made to lie in the word "*übersehen*," which Dr. Proudfit chooses to translate in the sense of "*omitted*." This implies, that it belonged to the first draft. "Can anything be said to be *omitted* in the printing," asks our censor triumphantly, "which was not *contained* in the manuscript copy? This very inscription substantiates, beyond a doubt, the statement of Dr. N. (1847), that in the third edition it was *restored* to the form in which it was originally composed. What shall we say then of Dr. N's. charge, in contradiction to all history, &c.—? We have no disposition to find a

¹ What was *overlooked* in the first edition, as especially fol. 55, has now been added by order of his Electoral Grace, 1563.

name for it." All this proof, however, is mere smoke. The first sense of the word "übersehen," as Dr. P. himself very well knows, is "overlooked." To overlook *may* signify to omit; an oversight is an omission; but no such term would be used to express a deliberate suppression, like that which is imagined in the case now before us. Had the addition thus accounted for been in truth part of the text as it first stood, the fact would have been stated in plain terms. Besides, the note was appended to the second edition as well as to the third; which however gave this question differently. The second then, according to this view, pretended to make good the *overseen* omission of copy in the first, but overlooked also itself the last clause, making room thus for still farther correction in the third. But again, the note refers to this novelty as one only, though the main one (*fürnemlich folio 55.*) among several alterations found in this third edition; for as Van Alpen informs us, "the first edition was in many things different from those that followed." These other differences seem not indeed to have touched the substance of the text, but to have been confined to the form in which it was printed, the division into sabbaths, and the citations of scriptural proof. But the word "übersehen" extends to them all; and if Dr. Proudfit's exegesis is good, it must follow that the whole of these later emendations belonged in truth to the original copy as drawn up by Ursinus, and had been omitted by oversight when it was first printed—a tough hypothesis, which even the Brunswick Professor himself, we presume, will hardly care to swallow. Altogether it is clear, that "übersehen" here is *not* to be forced into the meaning of "omitted;" but that it is to be taken in its proper secondary sense of "missed" or as we say, "wanting;" and simply informs the reader, that the additions, or new things, found in the 2nd and 3rd editions as compared with the first were brought in to complete the Catechism by order of his Grace the Elector, who was the head at once of both Church and State, so far as the Palatinate was then concerned. This implies, that the want of the 80th question in the first edition, as well as the other matters now corrected, might be considered a defect or oversight, a sort of chasm in the text that needed to be filled in order that it might be properly complete; but it implies nothing beyond this, and instead of substantiating the point for which it is urged by Dr. Proudfit, goes very decidedly, we think, to substantiate precisely the contrary.

Dr. Proudfit's conjectural construction, then, to explain the "gradual insertion of the 80th question," falls to the ground with the airy bottom on which it is made to rest. It is at best

not very honorable to Frederick and his theologians. Their zeal for truth gave birth in the first place to this question just as it now stands; but when ready, it was held most politic to keep it back, fear prevailing over faith in the Elector's mind. Gradually, however, the pious prince mustered courage to bring it out; first, all but the tail; and then the whole figure, tail and all; cunningly accounting for its tardy appearance, at the same time, by the transparent lie that it had been "overlooked" in the first edition, left out by accident rather than design. A pretty exemplification truly of Frederick's piety and good sense. Happily for his memory, however, the apology regards a case which is as purely hypothetical as itself. The entire "*fact*," of which it pretends to be the historical construction, resolves itself, as we have said before, into sheer smoke.

Still, the blunder itself is one towards which *we* at least are bound to exercise some indulgence; for it is one, into which our own book of 1847 somehow fell, as we have already seen; and our "precarious" example in the case, we are much inclined to suspect, has gone farther than any other appearance of authority to throw our brother of New Brunswick out of the right track. We certainly had some ground before us in 1847, which seemed at the time to justify the shape into which our statement was thrown in writing the "*History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*," but what it was exactly, we are now wholly at a loss to say; perhaps some expression in Van Alpen, whose work we have not had latterly within reach; most probably however, in any case, just some such misconstrued phrase or word, as we have now had under consideration from the note preserved by Niemeyer. At all events, when we came to speak of the point again in 1851, we found it impossible to verify what we said before of the original manuscript text. On the contrary, our authorities were plainly against it. Witnesses of the most respectable order, not before at hand, convinced us that our former statement was without proper foundation; a conclusion, which we saw to be required also by the inward evidence of the whole case. So we quietly receded from our earlier representation, making our statement in 1851 conformable to what we then believed, and now believe, to be the simple truth of history. The statement is given purposely in the most general terms. It does not say, that the 80.h question was wanting altogether in the first edition; for the authorities are ambiguous as to that point also, (Niemeyer has it, following Van Alpen, "*vel prorsus omis- sa vel mutilata*"); and it decides not how or whence the question came, when finally introduced into the text. The state-

ment looks only to the tail of the thing. That, at any rate, belonged neither to the first nor second edition. The harsh anathema formed no part of the original work, "as published under the hand of Ursinus himself;" even had it been in the manuscript draft, this would remain true; it was not *published* under his hand; his judgment, in that case, must be regarded as having gone against its publication. So much latitude our statement was purposely framed to include. But the latitude need not have been put so wide. The supposition of any such keeping back of the 80th question, and more especially the anathema which forms the tail of it, is purely gratuitous, and rests so far as we are able to see on no proof whatever.

But why was there no retraction then in 1851 of what had been said four years before in 1847, no explanation of the discrepancy between the earlier statement and the last? Dr. P. affects to find this very suspicious. But we beg leave to say, that it would have savored of pedantry, to go out of our way, in such an article as our Introduction to Williard's Ursinus, to clear up a circumstantial point of this sort, to show how we had been led to take a different view of the circumstance in question at different times. The object of our last article required no such digression; it was enough to state in general terms the historical fact, as it appeared to us at the time. What historian does not find occasion, in successive editions even of the same work, (if he be not himself a scientific automaton,) to correct himself in many more serious respects? But what historian is bound, in every instance of doing so, to parade an officious explanation of the acknowledged discrepancy? The case calls for no such anxious and tedious pedantry.

We have said, that the circumstance thus brought into small dispute is of no conclusive account, at any rate, for the reviewer's main object. Had the 80th question been prepared in full before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism, (whether from the pen of Ursinus or from that of Olevianus,) it would be still certain that it was deliberately stricken out, so far as it failed to appear in the *original publication*, and that the concluding anathema at least, "so foreign from the reigning spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus," formed no part of this publication, but was "wanting in the first two editions" altogether. The case, however, is made stronger, when we know that the later addition was no such originally rejected article or clause; and under this view it is that we now boldly appeal to it as abundantly bearing us out in all that we have said. It is a simple matter of historical fact, that the last clause of the 80th question formed

no part of the Catechism as first published ; that it was wanting in the second edition as well as the first ; and that it "was afterwards foisted in only by the authority of the Elector Frederick, in the way of angry retort and counterblast," over against certain corresponding fulminations of the Council of Trent.

We have lately furnished a series of historical authorities and quotations in proof of this general fact, in reply to the challenge of some unknown minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, through the columns of the Christian Intelligencer. It is not necessary to repeat them in this place. Their weight is not impaired in the least by anything in Dr. Proudfit's article. Rather we may say, he himself grants in truth the whole fact, which he makes a show of calling in question ; only trying to break the force of it, as we have seen, by foisting in (*pax verbo*) a perfectly untenable hypothesis for its explanation. The case is one, indeed, which allows of no dispute, and in reference to which we never dreamed of being called upon to make any defence. All writers on the Catechism agree, that the last clause of the 80th question did not belong to it as originally published, but was added to the third edition "*aus Churfürstlicher Gnaden.*"

But granting this, as he has to do, our Brunswick critic still labors to make out his charge of historical falsification, by raising small issues in his own way, for which there is no real ground in anything we have actually said, just for the purpose, as it might seem, of diverting attention from the only question that is really in debate. Thus the word "foist," he tells us, must mean "to insert by *forgery*," because it is so defined by Dr. Johnston ;¹ as if every man of common education did not know, that the reigning *usus loquendi* of this country at least allows it a much wider signification. We never thought of *forgery*, in applying it to the Elector Frederick. Webster defines it, "to insert surreptitiously, wrongfully, or without warrant." This the good old Elector did. When the Catechism was first ready for publication, it was submitted to a synod of the superintendents and leading pastors of the Palatinate for examination and review ; and thus approved, it came out under the sanction

¹ Hereupon the Professor grows tragic, with solemn mien, and deep sepulchral tone, delivering himself as follows : "Have then the Reformed Churches been teaching, preaching and expounding for nearly three centuries, a *forgery*, under the belief that it was a truth of God ! Such is the heavy charge brought against them by Dr. Nevin. Blessed be God, there is no truth in it"—A very affecting stroke of rhetoric certainly.

of proper ecclesiastical authority, as well as by order of the civil power. It was the work, not simply of Ursinus nor of Frederick, but of the Church. But the addition now before us was not in that first text. It was introduced afterwards, without any action of the church, by the sole authority of the temporal prince. That he had full political right to do this, under the Erastian order of the Palatinate, we are perfectly well aware. But had he any true church right to exercise such power? We believe not. It is not for any secular prince, to make articles of faith for the church within his realm, however pious may be his intentions. Frederick then acted without proper religious warrant, when he undertook to mend the Catechism from his own will. The liberty may have been sanctioned, by the subsequent acquiescence of the church. But still in itself it was arbitrary, temerarious, and wrong; and this is just what we meant to imply, when we applied to his conduct the disparaging word now under consideration. The malediction of the 80th question *was* "foisted" into the Catechism, after its first formal publication, by the sole authority of the Elector Frederick.

But now, according to Dr. Proudfit, this can bear but three interpretations, namely, "that the clause in question was inserted after the death of Ursinus, without his knowledge, or against his consent and convictions." We say, it calls not necessarily for any of these suppositions. Certainly Ursinus, who outlived Frederick, knew of this addition made to the Catechism before it was a year old, acquiesced in it with the rest of the church, and considered it doctrinally correct. But it does not follow from this, that it was not brought in without warrant by the Elector, or that the judgment of Ursinus went in favor of the supposed improvement. He might consider the clause theologically sound, and yet not wish to see it in the Catechism. Or, even if we suppose him fully reconciled to the thing, when it took place, the general nature of the fact, as we have stated it, remains the same. It is still certain, at all events, that the clause was not from the will of Ursinus, as this appears in the first publication of the Catechism; and also, that it was added afterwards, however publicly, on the sole responsibility of the Elector.

The following passage, quoted before on the point here in consideration as a note to our article in its Review form, (not seen probably, or at least not heeded, by our present critic,) it may be worth while here to quote again:

"Frederick by no means followed passively and blindly the counsel of his theologians; but the Reformed doctrine, and along
VOL. IV.—NO. 11. 11"

with it the most determined dislike towards the Roman worship, and towards all that was still retained from it in the Lutheran church, were for him a matter of strong inward and personal religious conviction, which he well knew himself how to uphold and defend from his own diligent and careful study of the Scriptures. From these, particularly from the *Old Testament*, he deduced his duty to tolerate no idolatry in his land, though it should be in never so mild and plausible a form. Hence in the *second* and *third* editions of the Heidelberg Catechism, the 80th question, by his positive order alone, and *against* the counsel and will of its authors, was made to receive the addition, then highly offensive and dangerous, 'So that the mass, at bottom, is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and sufferings of Jesus Christ, and an accurs d idolatry;' and he obstinately refused afterwards to give up the clause, in spite of all intimidations from the emperor and the empire set before him for the purpose."—Goebel, *Churches of the Rhine*, p. 365.

This writer, it will be seen, does not hesitate to say that the addition to the 80th question was brought in *against* the counsel and will positively of Ursinus and Olevianus. Our language has been much more reserved and guarded. We have said merely that it was wanting in the Catechism as they first gave it to the world, and that it was foisted in afterwards by another will.

So says *Seisen* also, in his late *Denkschrift* (p. 204.) devoted specially to the History of the Reformation in Heidelberg. *Vierordt*, in his History of the Reformation in Baden, (p. 466,) has the same testimony. So the article on the Heidelberg Catechism in the Encyclopedia of *Ersch* and *Gruber*; so *Niemeyer*, as we have just seen (p. 57, 58); so *Böckel* (p. 398); and so *Henry Alting*, in his Hist. Eccl. Pal. (c. 44), who says the addition was made "ex speciali Electoris mandato."

Dr. Proudfit takes pains, in his characteristic style, to show that Melancthon and Ursinus had a bad opinion of the mass, as well as of Romanism generally, and that it is *therefore* false to say that the anathema of the Catechism was "foreign from their spirit." This is small criticism, and when all is done a mere quibble. We know very well, that all the Reformers

¹ *Ebrard*, in his work on the Lord's Supper (Vol. II. p. 609), also takes occasion to tell his readers, that "the last clause of the celebrated 80th question is *not original*, but was added first in the *third* edition, *most arbitrarily* (höchst eigenhändig), by the Elector," language quite as strong, we think, as the "foisted in" of our own article.

were enemies to the church of Rome and denounced the Roman mass. But what then? Will it follow, that all of them were alike prepared and disposed to insert this sweeping clause of the 80th question, in a standing church symbol? Or supposing even they were so, through stress of controversial zeal, might not this itself be still, for some of them at least, a thing foreign from their own reigning spirit? Luther could be violent enough against the mass, when it suited; but for all this, we know very well that *his* spirit here was not the same with that of Zuingli; as altogether the *animus* of Lutheranism, we may say, was materially different from that of the Reformed confession. So Melancthon may say very hard things of Romanism; but it is gross wrong to argue from this, that he was not any more mild and irenic in his spirit than Luther and the other Reformers generally. We know that he was. His character is, in this respect, well settled in history, and not to be overthrown by any special pleading or quibbling, in Dr. Proudfit's peculiar vein. It is notorious too, that Ursinus, with all his constitutional earnestness, partook largely of the same quiet and pacific spirit. Dr. P. indeed allows himself to question his title to the praise we have bestowed upon him on this score; but with no good reason that we can see, in the face of our own remark, that "it is characteristic of such a soft and quiet nature to be at the same time ardent, and excitable on occasions even to passion." Then again, the reigning spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism is not a point that can be said to be now open for contradiction or debate. No one questions its decidedly Protestant character, its general opposition to the church of Rome, its Reformed or Calvinistic complexion as distinguished from high Lutheranism. But with all this, its predominant character is truly like that of Melancthon himself, full of moderation and peace, rich in gentleness and love throughout. Altogether then, we had a perfect right to characterise the harsh anathema attached to the 80th question, as "foreign from the spirit of Melancthon and Ursinus, and from the reigning tone also of the Heidelberg Catechism." It is not in fair keeping with the proper ecclesiastical genius of these great men; and it forms a marked exception to the method and manner of the Catechism, to its general bearing, as it comes before us at all other points.

Another specimen of our critic's special pleading, equally sophistical and unfair, is presented to us in the way he deals with certain leading features attributed by our article to the Heidelberg Catechism, particularly its *mystical* element and its sympathy with the old *catholic* life of the church. His remarks on

"mysticism," which he takes as of one sense simply with "mystery," and as the exclusion of intelligibility, are sufficiently illogical, not to say ridiculously absurd. And it is if possible still more absurd, to deny what we have said of the "catholic" spirit of the Catechism, by just assuming at once that this must mean sympathy with the distinguishing features of Romanism at the time of the Reformation, and then going on gravely to show that the formulary is plainly antagonistic to this system, on all proper Protestant points. As if any one in his senses could ever think otherwise of a *Reformed* symbol! This however is the very "art and mystery," on which the reviewer mainly relies, for giving effect to his whole attack. He sees in all a covert league with Romanism, a design even to Romanize the Reformed church, by making it appear that the Heidelberg Catechism is after all more Roman than Protestant. To such end looks and runs the word "catholic;" and this again is the key to the changes rung on that other word 'mystical.' It is all to seduce Protestants into the arms of the "Great Harlot." But Dr. Proudfit can see through the mill-stone of this awful "gun-powder plot," and he will set the world right. If it be too late to save the German Reformed church from being swallowed up alive by the horrible snare, (without knowing it,) he will see to it at least that the Reformed Dutch church, and all other branches of the Reformed church, be properly warned and kept out of harm's way. So we have the cry, *Romanism! Romanism!* lustily shouted for effect. That is always sure, in such a case, to carry the popular ear. For the popular mind too, it is able to cover a multitude of sins, offences we mean against logic as well as charity and truth. "But is it really so?" asks the fanatical jealousy thus roused, rubbing its owlish eyes, and peering into the dark inane.—"Certainly," our alarmist replies, "you may see it in this picture of the Catechism and Ursinus, as plain as the nose on your own face."—"Where? Do in pity tell."—"Why *there*, in what is said of the catholic and mystical spirit of the work. Do not these terms point straight towards Rome? Is she not 'MYSTERY,' by apocalyptic seal? And is not she also the '*Catholic*' church? But the Catechism has always been praised for its simplicity and perspicuity. It is notoriously at war moreover with Romanism; else why should it have been so fiercely assaulted by the Papists, when it first appeared? Does Rome not know her own friends? *Ergo*, this picture of the Heidelberg Catechism, both as given in 1847 and now as we have it here again in 1851, we are bound to consider insidious and false."—So runs the argument; lame enough in

all conscience; made up of *ad captandum* clap-trap mainly; but for this very reason also, we may add, but too sure of its own currency with the popular prejudice to which it makes its appeal.

All this however does not disturb in the least the truth of our picture, taken in its own fair and proper sense. The Catechism remains still truly *Melancthonian* in its constitution; and carries in it accordingly both a catholic spirit and a rich mystical vein, beyond all that is to be found of this sort in any other symbolical book of the Reformed confession.

It breathes, we say, a *catholic* spirit. This does not mean, that it is either Roman or Lutheran in its theological mind; we know that it is neither; we speak of it always as a Reformed symbol, and judge it from the standpoint and standard of its own class. The Reformed confession includes various types of thought, receding more or less from Lutheranism and Catholicism in the Roman form. Modern Puritanism forms the extreme left of this prismatic spectrum, the greatest possible refraction, where the light of Christianity shades off finally, through the faint violet of Baptist Independentcy, into clear Unitarian negation. The Heidelberg Catechism, on the other hand, represents just the other side of the Reformed scheme, that namely by which it lies next to the original Lutheran confession, and so in felt organic connection also with the past life of the church in its universal character. This grew in some measure necessarily out of the circumstances of its formation; the fact was felt and acknowledged, when the symbol first made its appearance; and the evidence of it is still open to all, in the work itself. It has found more favor even in the Lutheran church, than any other symbol belonging to the Reformed interest; and for this latter interest itself, as we all know, it was exalted at once to a sort of ecumenical authority; a fact, of itself sufficient to attest its catholic character. This character here, however, implies more than mere liberality. Unitarianism is liberal; all indifferentism, all negative rationalism, is liberal in its own way; carries in itself just because it is negative, no positive contents for faith and life. Catholicity, on the contrary, supposes faith, truth, concrete reality, a given substance in the form of religion, a divine historical fact to be submitted to by all men, and found to be commensurate with the universal wants of the world. Such is the old force of the term, as employed to express a characteristic attribute of the church from the beginning. So understood, it carries in it necessarily the idea of sympathy and correspondence with the old life of Christianity, as this has formed the historical identity of the church through all ages, before the

Reformation as well as since; for surely this life must have comprehended in it the true and proper substance of Christianity all along, (however overlaid with corruptions and errors,) from which to be disunited, must be held to be one and the same thing with ecclesiastical death. The catholicity of the Heidelberg Catechism then involves certainly, as it ought to do, "sympathy with the religious life of the old Catholic Church." In this trait, it goes beyond all other Reformed symbols; though it is in contrast with the later forms of Puritanism mainly, that its significance comes fully into view. The Reformed faith generally in the beginning, though not just of one type here, owned the necessity of such fellowship in spirit with the historical substance of Catholicism as it had come down from other ages; and for this very reason fell in easily with the catholic soul and voice of the Heidelberg Catechism. But no such mind belongs to modern Puritanism. This has almost no sympathy whatever with the old church faith. All really churchly and catholic ideas, are for it a perfect abomination. It disowns the sacraments in their ancient sense, and scouts the obligation of the creed. In contradistinction to this system, that now affects to be not only the whole sense of the Reformed confession, (which notoriously it is not,) but the whole sense also of whole Protestantism, (which is a still greater falsehood,) we have characterised the Catechism as being in its reigning spirit historical and catholic. It is not Puritan. Modern Puritanism could not use it with hearty freedom and good-will; and those who try to bend it to this standard, are always guilty of doing it gross violence and wrong. Its veneration for the creed, its doctrine of the holy sacraments, at once place it in a different order of religious faith. It does not go on the assumption, that the truths of Christianity may be put together in any and every way to suit the private judgment of modern times;¹ but holds the form and order of the creed to be the necessary type, and indispensable condition,

¹ "Protestantism takes the doctrines of the Bible into its creed, in just such an order as it thinks *to be natural*. But the other system holds itself bound to the order of the Apostles' Creed." Thus speaks the Puritan Recorder, in its caricature not long since of our second article on Early Christianity; not aware seemingly of the abyss of rationalism, which such a confession involves. For "Protestantism" however in this case, we should read "Puritanism." This last does indeed pretend to reconstruct Christianity from the bottom, putting its parts together as to itself seems natural; but original Protestantism was guilty of no such presumption. It felt itself bound to follow the Apostles' Creed, and the decisions of the first general councils.

of all sound doctrine; a true *regula fidei*, the force of which must extend with real plastic power to every other article of evangelical belief to make it really orthodox and right. "No Protestant doctrine can ever be held in a safe form, which is not so held as to be in truth a living branch from the trunk of this primitive symbol, in the consciousness of faith."

The Catechism, we say again, makes room largely for the *mystical* interest in religion, as well as for that which is merely logical and intellectual. We doubt whether Dr. Proudfit has the idea at all which this term is employed to express, by such writers for instance as Neander or Ullmann, when applied to the subject of the religious life under the opposition now stated; for it is not easy to understand otherwise, how it could be so grossly caricatured as we find it to be in his hands. The Catechism is not made up of riddles certainly, transcendentalisms or far fetched Delphic oracles. Its "*mystik*" is not mystification, mysticism in the bad sense. But what then? We may say the same thing, with just as much force, of the Bible. Is there then no mystical element here? Are its propositions of so much force only, in general, as may be felt through the medium of the logical understanding? The Old Testament is throughout mystical, the letter symbolizing the spirit, the face of Moses covered

* Dr. Proudfit puts on a show of surprise over the following declaration, found in one of our late articles: "However much of rubbish the Reformation found occasion to remove, it was still compelled to do homage to the main body of the Roman theology as orthodox and right; and to this day Protestantism has no valid mission in the world, any farther than it is willing to build on this old foundation." If he can really think that the truth of this statement is set aside by a couple of exclamation points, we have only to say that we pity his theological and historical knowledge. Let any one take the trouble merely to read the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, or even the Catechism only of the Council of Trent, and if he have a spark of ingenuous feeling in him, he will be heartily ashamed of the ignorance and prejudice that too commonly reign among Protestants with regard to this point. The great body of our divinity, God be praised, is not of yesterday, but has come down to us as a rich legacy from former times, through the Roman Catholic church. The same may be said of the ethical wealth, which is embodied in our modern civilization. How much of all, pray, do we owe to the Waldenses, Albigenses, and Paulicians! Take away the old Catholic trunk, and there can be no worth nor life in any Protestant doctrine. The mission of Protestantism most certainly, if it be from heaven and not as its enemies tell us from hell, is to build on the foundation already laid, and not to lay a new one for its own use. The article of justification by faith, for instance, is sound and good, if it be rooted in a heartfelt submission to the objective mysteries of the Apostles' Creed; whereas without this, as among our more unsacramental sects generally, it must be regarded as only a pestiferous delusion.

with a veil "which is done away in Christ." Christ's parables are mystical, resting on real and not simply notional analogies between the world of nature and the world of grace, which neither thought nor language can fully fathom, which can be *felt* only in the profoundest depths of the soul. The same may be said of his miracles. To a truly contemplative faith, they mean immeasurably more than they at once outwardly express. His teaching partook largely of the same character. "The words that I speak unto you," he said himself, "they are spirit and they are life." They are pregnant with a sense which goes far beyond either grammar or logic; missing which altogether, having no organ for it indeed, our rational exegesis too often turns them into mere "flesh that profiteth nothing." The sacred writers of the New Testament generally show more or less of the same quality; but most of all he who leaned on Jesus' bosom, and whom the ancients compare with the eagle soaring towards the sun. Without some sense for the mystical, no interpreter can understand or expound St. John. Who has not felt the force and beauty of the celebrated picture applied to him by Claudius: "Twilight and night; and through them the quick gleaming lightning. A soft evening cloud, and behind it the big full moon bodily!" Does this imply unintelligibility, or the opposite of clear simplicity? According to Dr. Proudfit's scheme of thinking, it does; but listen to Olshausen, to say the least quite as competent a judge: "The thoughts of John have the greatest simplicity, and along with this a metaphysical spirituality, they carry in them logical sharpness, without having proceeded from the standpoint of mere reflection. Born from the depth of intuition, they are still far from the cloudiness and confusion of mysticism; expressed in the plainest language, they unite in themselves the depth of genuine *mystik* with the clearness and precision of genuine *scholastik*. Where indeed the intuitive powers are wanting, or lie still undeveloped, the depth of John however clear must appear to be darkness; but for such standpoint also the Gospel of John was not written."¹ Now we

¹ *Bib. Comm.* Vol. II. p. 24.—Take the following passage also to the same point from Schaff's *Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*, p. 344: "With Paul, John possesses in common depth of knowledge. They are the two apostles, who have left for us the fullest and most developed schemes of doctrine. But their knowledge is of different sort. Paul, trained in the school learning of the Pharisees, is an uncommonly sharp thinker and skilful dialectician, exhibiting the Christian doctrines for intellectual comprehension, proceeding from ground to consequence, from cause to effect, from the general to the particular, from propositions to conclusions, with

do not pretend to make the Heidelberg Catechism of one character here, with this sacred composition; we only make use of the example, to show the absurdity of the criticism that has been so pompously paraded against the whole idea of a mystical element in the Catechism, as well as to illustrate in what general sense we and others have attributed to it such a quality, and are disposed to vindicate for it the same honorable distinction still.

Let it be kept in mind, that we speak of it relatively to its own class. It is a *Reformed* symbol, and must be judged of from the bosom of this confession. What we have said before of the genius of the Reformed confession, as being naturally unfavorable to the mystical element and disposed to move rather in the line of mere logical reflection, is too well established as a fact to be unsettled at all by the flimsy dialectics brought to bear upon it by Dr. Proudfit. It is acknowledged by all respectable writers on comparative symbolism. Not to speak of Zuingli, we find in Calvin here a spiritual nature very different from that of Luther. He is more rigorously rational and dialectic. This does not of itself imply reproach; for if the Bible abounds in one of the elements now contrasted, it abounds in the other likewise. If John is mystical, Paul is no less logical, with the same title to inspiration. There is a sound rationalism in religion, as well as a sound mysticism; though both terms, nakedly taken, carry in our language commonly a bad sense. This very fact, however, shows how possible it is for the right in either case to run into wrong; and we are reminded by it, at the same time, that each tendency is exposed naturally to its own abuse, and not to that of the other. Thus it is, that the logical interest in religion, as we find it represented by the Reformed confession since the days of Zuingli and Calvin, though in itself a very good and necessary side of our common Christianity, carries in itself always notwithstanding a dangerous liability to become rationalistic. Not as if danger lay only on this side, and all was security on the other. But the danger of one side is not just that of the

true logical evidence and precision—a representative thus of genuine scholasticism (*Scholastik*) in the best sense of the word. The knowledge of John is intuition and contemplation. He sees his object with the soul (*Gemüth*), he takes in all as a single picture, and represents thus the deepest truths without proof, as an eye-witness, in their immediate originality. His knowledge of divine things is the deep reaching gaze of love, which always directs itself to the centre, and from this outwards embraces all points of the periphery at one glance. He is the representative of all genuine mysticism (*Mystik*)."

other. The constitutional leaning of the Reformed church is, not towards bad mysticism, but towards bad rationalism. Now what we have said in relation to the Heidelberg Catechism is simply this, that it goes beyond all other symbols of its own confession in a proper combination of the mystical element with the merely rational, in the business of religious instruction. This by no means denies to it the common quality of the Reformed theology, logical clearness and precision; but on the contrary assumes this rather to be the reigning character of the work. "The Heidelberg Catechism," we expressly say, "has regard throughout to the lawful claims of the understanding; its author was thoroughly versed in all the dialectic subtleties of the age, and an uncommonly fine logic in truth distinguishes its whole composition. But *along with this* runs, at the same time, a continual appeal to the interior sense of the soul, a sort of solemn under tone, sounding from the depths of the invisible world, which only an unction from the Holy One can enable any fully to hear and understand. The words are *often* felt, in this way, to mean much more than they logically express. The Catechism is no cold workmanship merely of the rationalizing intellect. It is full of feeling and faith."

It is not easy, of course, to prove or exemplify for the merely logical understanding the presence of a quality, which addresses itself wholly to a different organ. To be apprehended at all, it must be felt. We may appeal again, however, to the sympathy in which the Catechism stands with the theory of religion embodied in the Apostles' Creed, and its palpable disagreement here with the spirit and genius of modern Puritanism. In the view of the creed, all religion rests in the acknowledgment of the mystery of the incarnation and its necessary consequences, historically considered, in the felt living sense of these supernatural realities, submitted to as actually at hand in the world by faith. The system includes the idea of the church, as the medium of salvation, and of divine sacraments carrying in them objective force and power. But this churchly and sacramental side of religion, involves of itself the force of what we now speak of as the mystical interest in proper conjunction with the merely intellectual or rational. Puritanism, in its modern shape, may be said to lack it altogether. It deals with religion as a matter of purely individual opinion and private experience. It turns it objectively into a mere abstraction. With the Heidelberg Catechism, on the contrary, it is regarded as a living concrete power. The catechumen is set down in the bosom as it were of the new creation, as a divine supernatural fact, and is

taught to give his responses accordingly, not simply from the standpoint of outward reflection, (as in the case for instance of the excellent Westminster Catechism,) but from the condition of faith; the things being treated as of actual validity for him, as a member of the church by baptism, in virtue of what the church is for all the purposes of salvation by the constitution of its own glorious Head. Some have made this very feature an objection to the Catechism. But it agrees with all ecclesiastical antiquity, and falls in too with the general tone and style of the New Testament.

Look only at the sacramental doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism, the light especially in which it presents the mystery of the Saviour's presence in the holy eucharist. Dr. Proudfit, for some reason, avoids this point, only transiently touching on what he takes to be our disposition to lay too much stress on the mystical view of this sacrament. We have been a little surprised indeed, that in undertaking to vindicate the *innocence* of the Catechism against our representations, he should have taken no notice of what we have said of its differing from the Lutheran doctrine of the sacramental presence, on the question of mode only, and not at all on the question of fact. Some have pretended heretofore to deny this, and to make us out guilty of a serious error for asserting in favor of the old Reformed faith anything better than the rationalistic conception so common in modern times. We take it to be of some account, so far as this point is concerned, that Dr. Proudfit does not venture to make any open capital of the matter, however well suited it might seem at first view for his general purpose. This amounts in the circumstances to a sort of quiet acknowledgment, that here at least we have the advantage of the cause he represents; that the participation of Christ's glorified body in the sacrament, through the mirifical intervention of the Spirit, was held by the Reformed church generally in the sixteenth century; and that it is plainly taught, over and over again, in the Heidelberg Catechism. Dr. Proudfit knows too, that it is taught in the Confession of the Reformed Dutch church, in terms that shut out every sort of ambiguity. Does the Dutch church, at the present time, still hold fast to this part of her proper hereditary faith? Does our critic, Dr. Proudfit himself, regard it as anything more than a figure of rhetoric? We presume not to answer either of these questions. One thing is certain however; namely, that the sacramental doctrine of the Heidelberg Catechism is not in conformity with the present reigning *Puritan* standard, and that it is distinguished from this precisely by its mystical element, by

its acknowledgment of a real mystery of grace in the holy sacrament, which was universally owned by the ancient church, but which Puritanism now sees fit to reject.¹ This distinction, however, implies a great deal more than itself nakedly considered. It may suit a certain style of theology, to conceive of the sacramental doctrine of the old Reformed faith as a sort of outward accident only, in no organic connection with its general system, and capable of being dis severed from it with gain rather than loss. But in its own nature, as we may easily enough see, the case is of a very different character. The doctrine in question must of necessity condition materially the whole system or scheme to which it belongs; and nothing therefore can be more precarious, than to think of measuring and trying this by another system, that is not conditioned in its constitution by any such doctrine whatever. It is in vain to affect little or no regard for the point here brought into view, as though it were after all a small matter that the old idea of sacramental grace has been so widely lost in the religious thinking of the present time. Unless we take the ground that the universal ancient church was out of its senses on this subject, and that original Protestantism labored also with regard to it under the most perfect delusion, we must see and feel that the modern error is something more than a single dead fly merely, causing the ointment of the apothecary to stink. It reaches far into the very life of faith and piety; and it is hard to say which class of persons most deserves indignant

¹ Dr. Proudfit dislikes our use of the word "mystery." It is painful, he says, to hear it brought forward so much, in connection with the church and the sacraments. It is a favorite term with Romanists, the proper badge indeed of the Papacy; "for which very reason," if we take his word for it, "the Reformers eschewed both the word and the thing." Could we well have however, we ask in return, a more palpable apology for laying stress on the word, at the present time, than just such a barefaced attempt in the bosom, not of New England Congregationalism, but of the Reformed Dutch church, to kill and root out from Protestantism the whole glorious idea which the word represents? It is not true, that the Reformers eschewed either the word or the thing. Will it be pretended, that Luther made no account of the *mystery* of the holy eucharist, that he looked upon it as a mere "supper," in the low rationalistic sense insinuated (note p. 117) by Dr. Proudfit? And is it not just this unmystical view that Calvin stigmatizes as profane? The sacraments have always been mysteries for the faith of the church, and must remain so as long as there is any true faith in the world. The church itself is a mystery. All the articles of the creed are mysteries; not simply in the sense of unfathomable doctrines, but in the sense of gloriously awful supernatural realities, historically present for faith in the bosom of the world under its natural form. Of all this, Puritanism, we are sorry to say, seems now to have almost no sense whatever.

reprehension and rebuke ; those who wantonly discard the mystery of the sacrament altogether, as it was once universally received, or those who condescendingly profess to make still some account of it, and yet the next moment turn round and shake hands with the first openly unbelieving class, as being after all of one mind with it mainly in its virulent opposition to every churchly idea, and as having no power apparently to see any danger whatever in the contrary direction. Only think of the distinction between Pedobaptists and Anti-pedobaptists, the whole significance of which turns on the old idea of sacramental grace, sinking in the estimation of the first into the character of a mere secondary circumstance ; or of American Lutheranism betaking itself for support and backing, in its unsacramental tendencies, to a tribunal which holds the mystery of the holy catholic church for a figment, and charges the Apostles' creed with wholesale heresy !

But our critic finds another string to play his *ad captandum* strain upon, for the ear of popular prejudice particularly in his own church. We have made it a merit of the Heidelberg formula, that it takes care "to avoid the thorny, dialectic subtleties of Calvinism." This statement he affects to find "truly astonishing." Was it not called by way of eminence the Calvinistic Catechism ; and so attacked by its enemies ; and so received by all branches of the Reformed church ? "Why was its author banished from Breslau as a Calvinist ?" Nay is it not called by Dr. N himself a *Calvinistic* symbol ? This and much more we have to like declamatory purpose ; on the strength of which then the ground is boldly taken, that there is no truth in our assertion, that the hard knotty points in question are all brought out with marked prominence in the Catechism, and that it is the very height of temerity to represent it as avoiding them in any way whatever.

Now of all this we must be allowed to say in plain terms, that it is either very ignorant or else very dishonest. In the first place, does Dr. Proudfit really need to be informed, like the merest tyro in church history, that the term *Calvinistic*, as used in the sixteenth century, in opposition to the term "Lutheran," and as of one sense frequently with "Reformed," is not just of the same signification with this term as now popularly understood in its relation to Arminianism ? In our time, it carries in it at once a reference to the doctrine of the divine decrees, and is taken for the most part in no other sense ; whereas, in the age of the Reformation, its reference was most immediately to the doctrine of the holy sacraments. As distinguished from Luth-

eran, it had regard mainly to the proper Reformed view of the Lord's supper, as classically explained and defended by the great Genevan Reformer in his Institutes and other writings. In this sense only Melancthon, in the latter part of his life, was looked upon as a sort of *Calvinist*. In this sense it was notoriously, that Ursinus came under the reproach of *Calvinism*, in his native city Bresslau. In this sense the Palatinate became *Calvinistic* or Reformed in the year 1562; and in this sense mainly the Heidelberg Catechism was afterwards known and spoken of as a *Calvinistic* symbol.¹ It was not Lutheran. It went with Calvin, in opposition to Luther, on the mode of the eucharistic mystery.

In the next place, we ask again, does Dr. Proudfit really need to be informed, that the confessional distinction expressed by the title "*Reformed*," as opposed to Lutheranism, was not originally by any means synonymous with a formally professed allegiance to Calvin's theory of the decrees, much less with a full acknowledgment of all the knotty points of this theory as it was first published in his name. "The Protestants in Holland, Bremen, Poland, Hungary, and the Palatinate," says the historian Mosheim, speaking of the Reformed church in the sixteenth century "followed indeed the French and Helvetic churches in their sentiments concerning the eucharist, in the simplicity of their worship, and in their principles of ecclesiastical polity; but *not* in their notions of predestination, which intricate doctrine they left undefined, and submitted to the free examination and private judgment of every individual. It may farther be affirmed, that before the Synod of Dort, no Reformed church had obliged its members, by any special law, or article of faith, to adhere to the doctrine of the church of Geneva relating to the primary causes of the salvation of the elect or the ruin of the reprobate."² It is admitted by Mosheim, at the same time, that the

¹ We have heard of cases, in which advantage has been taken of this very amphibology, to draw both the members and the property of German congregations into the fold of Presbyterianism "You are *Calvinistic*; that is the very title by which you hold your corporate rights; this however is our title; so you belong to us, the only distinction between us being that you are German and we are English; which is at an end, of course, as soon as you pass from the use of one language to the other." Many an honest German has been puzzled out of his own ecclesiastical identity by this logic; which possibly his English neighbor also, no wiser than himself, has used upon him with perfectly good faith.

² Eccles. Hist., Cent. XVI, Sect. III, Part II, Chap. II, (MacLaine's Translation).

greatest part of the Reformed doctors, in the countries now mentioned, fell by degrees of their own accord into the Genevan system; a fact "principally owing, no doubt, to the great reputation of the academy of Geneva, which was generally frequented, in this century, by those among the Reformed who were candidates for the ministry." Along with this tendency, however, went from the beginning also an endeavor in different quarters to qualify the rigors of the original system; whilst in some branches of the church at least, it was distinctly understood and avowed that this side of Calvinism formed no part of the public faith whatever. Such particularly was the case with the German Reformed church. The *Confession of Sigismund* (Niemeyer, p. 650, 651) expressly rejects the idea of unconditional decrees. The *Repetitio Anhaltina* (Niemeyer, p. 638, 639) carefully refuses to acknowledge any other cause or principle of election than what we find in the express word of the Gospel itself; according to which the preaching of repentance and grace is universal or for all, and the number of the saved is determined only by the fact of their obedience and faith; the predestination referring mainly to Christ, and God's immutable purpose to save in him, and by him, *sine prosopolepsia*, all that fly to him for redemption and cleave to him perseveringly to the end. The *Declaration of Cassel*, issued by the General Synod of Hessa, A. 1607, professes (art. 6) to believe and teach on the high mystery of election all that is written of it in the bible; "and beyond this," it adds, "we believe and teach nothing; but refrain rather from the hard terms employed by some others, that might be an occasion to the simple either of despair or of carnal security, and hold ourselves to such terms as may serve with men the purposes of firm consolation and true godly living: And to be still more explicit, our confession here is just the same with what Mr. Luther has drawn out from God's word in his Preface to the Epistle to the Romans." Universally, we may say, the relation of the German Reformed church to the Lutheran was such as to involve, almost as a matter of course, this moderate view of predestination and its kindred points. It was not here in any special sense, that the two confessions in Germany felt

¹See HEPPE's late work "*Die Einführung der Verbesserungspunkte in Hessa von 1604-1610*," (a contribution to the history of the German Reformed church from original documents,) p. 74, 78. Here we have, according to Heppé, the doctrine of Luther and Melancthon in regard to predestination, "as the same is found also in the *Heidelberg Catechism*;" while on the sacraments the Declaration gives us Melancthonian Calvinism.

themselves divided. Both professed to rest on the same basis of the original Augsburg Confession. It was only when it came to the mode of the mystery, which both acknowledged in the Lord's supper, that they could not agree.

This explains the general character and posture of the Heidelberg Catechism. It is primarily the leading standard symbol of the German Reformed church. It is Calvinistic; but the force of this distinction lies mainly in its doctrine of the sacraments; while on the subject of the divine decrees, it falls in rather, as far as it goes, with the Melancthonian view, avoiding however the more knotty points of the matter altogether. This does not imply certainly, that it goes for Arminianism or Pelagianism, or that it expressly contradicts the points it refuses to teach. Dr. Proudfit appeals to its universal reception among the Reformed churches, to prove that it must have contained all that the Synod of Dort, for instance, or the Westminster Assembly, held to be essential here to full orthodox belief.¹ But this is absurd. Such universal reception shows just the contrary; namely, that it did not contain all that might be exacted by the more rigorous Predestinarians; since in that case, how could it have suited the more moderate class, the Melancthonian spirit in particular of the German church from which it took its rise. It suited all, just *because* it stopped short of determinations in regard to which all were not of the same mind. In this view, it is not to be measured by the full theological system even of its own authors. It was not by any means necessary, that they should put into such a formulary, intended for public and general use, all the details of their own belief, as they might see fit to bring them forward in the lecture room or pulpit. It is evident, on the contrary, that this was avoided with deliberate purpose and design. The authors of the work have taken pains to hold their own theological convictions as it were in check, in order that the text might be more general, and in this way true

¹ "How must the Dutch, German, and Swiss Reformed churches, be amazed to find that they have been expounding from their pulpits, and teaching to their children, for almost three centuries, a Catechism in which doctrines which they have ever deemed vital and precious forms of evangelical truth, are 'avoided' and 'not brought forward as necessary objects of orthodox belief!' How incredibly strange that the Westminster Assembly never detected this Laodicean latitudinarianism, but blindly gave it their earnest commendation."—Why not go into hysterics at once over the deplorable thought, that all Christendom has been using for many more centuries the creed and the Lord's prayer, which yet labor here under still more dismal latitudinarianism.

to the objective church life with which they were surrounded. This we know was not by any means prepared, in the Palatinate, to accept what may be called extreme Calvinism, on the subject of the decrees; and from everything of that sort, accordingly, the Heidelberg symbol was made carefully to abstain.

"The Catechism," says *Ebrard*, "is known to follow the course of the Epistle to the Romans (with omission of Rom. ix-xi). The misery of man, redemption, and thankfulness, form the three main divisions. The disposition is throughout anthropological and soteriological, not speculative. If it has been rightly observed, that the Reformed theology rests on one speculative principle, that of dependance upon God in the predestinarian sense, let us take good care not to confound theology and the church; let us bear in mind, how just this Heidelberg Catechism, with its wholly anthropologico-soteriological view of the material principle of faith, has found such vast circulation in the Reformed church as a book of instruction, and wrought with so much effect on the practical church life. The predestinarian theory was tolerated in the Reformed church, and taken up as an organic member into her spiritual life; but it is one of the essential peculiarities precisely of this church, that with genuine catholicity she has tolerated side by side different schools and modes of apprehension. One who should identify the predestinarian system with the spirit of the Reformed church, would deal with her as the Flaccian party have done with the Lutheran. Along with Calvinism in the strict sense, is found in the Reformed church the more lax Zuinglianism, (I speak not now of the sacramental doctrine, but of church life generally,) and thirdly the Palatine or German Reformed churchdom. Here breathed Melancthon's spirit. Predestination, as all know, is nowhere taught in the Heidelberg Catechism with so much as a single word; the whole view has proceeded as it were out of Melancthon's heart."¹

Seisen, in his History of the Reformation in Heidelberg, takes the same view of Melancthon's relation to the church of the Palatinate, and to the Catechism; and says of this last expressly (p. 205) that the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination enters not formally into its teaching.

Vierordt, (Hist. of the Reformation in Baden, p. 467), disposes of the matter in the same way, with the somewhat dry and curt remark: "The doctrine of absolute election is not express-

¹ Dogma vom h. Abendm. Vol. II. p. 603, 604.
VOL. IV.—NO. II.

ed in the Heidelberg Catechism; and only in later times have some tried to extract it artificially out of the 32nd question."

But a truce with authorities. The Catechism is before us, and may safely enough be allowed to speak for itself. What is the amount of our representation? Not that the general idea of election is wanting in its religious scheme; much less that it is excluded or contradicted. Not that it refuses absolutely to serve as a basis for the theology of Dort or Westminster, if any think it necessary to carry out the Reformed doctrine in that way. Nothing at all of this sort; but only, that it does not bring into view the more knotty points of Calvinism, that it takes care to avoid its thorny dialectic subtleties, that it stops short of certain hard positions in regard to which the Reformed church itself has not been of one mind, not urging them as "necessary objects of belief." And can there be any intelligent doubt on this subject? Dr. Proudfit does indeed make a show of triumphantly proving the contrary. But it is at best a very empty show, as any child may easily see that will take the trouble of examining his references. "The reader has but to take this work into his hand," he tells us, "and read over questions 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, (but if we would complete the enumeration, we must include by far the greater portion of the Catechism—we will only add therefore the 21st,) with the author's own exposition, and he will see these same 'hard, knotty points,' unfolded as rich life-germs of truth to all the uses of christian comfort and sanctification." This is so very loose and wide, as at once to convict itself of being totally without force. Strange indeed, if the Catechism should so teem with the character here in question, and the best theological eyes have failed to see it for so long a time! The questions here referred to say not a word in form of any of the hard points, now under consideration. The exposition of Ursinus goes occasionally farther than the text explained; but this by no means authorises the idea, that the text in every such instance formally teaches what is thus brought in by the lecturer; for what we have asserted is, that the formulary itself has not been carried out by the authors here to the full length even of their own convictions, that these were held in check rather for the purpose of making it more true to the general objective life it was formed to represent. It is not true indeed, that Ursinus does commit himself in his exposition to the hard extremes of Calvinism, in the way intimated by Dr. Proudfit. The references given in support of the assertion, prove nothing of the sort, and can hardly be said to have any relevancy whatever to the question in hand.*

* The topic of Predestination he handles in form under the 54th question,

But we look not now to this. What we have to do with is the explicit formal teaching of the Catechism itself. Were there a question as to the actual sense of any part of its text, as in the case for instance of what is said of the mystical side of the Lord's supper, all would depend on the author's own commentary. But where no part of the text is brought forward for interpretation, it is idle to fetch in any such help. The most that can be made of the author's exposition in that case, is that he considered the text a fair and fit basis for the use made of it in this way. We have not questioned the practicability of building on the Catechism a rigorous scheme of the divine decrees; nay, we have expressly said, that it could not have been endorsed by the Synod of Dort, if this body had not supposed its own theological system to be fairly involved in it so far as it went. But for all this, it would be ridiculous to pretend that all the determinations of the Synod of Dort are formally taught in the Heidelberg Catechism. And so we say, the hard points generally of metaphysical Calvinism are not there. To prove the contrary, it is not enough to get at them by derivation and roundabout construction. We must be pointed to some plain and direct teaching of the text itself: Where is the formal and explicit enunciation of these hard points to be found? In what terms are they made to challenge attention and regard? What questions bring them distinctly into view? Not the 1st, 2nd, 7th, 8th, or 21st certainly, to which we are referred by Dr. Proudfit; nor any others, we presume, on which he is likely soon to lay his discriminating finger.

To bring the case down to particulars. Where do we find the supralapsarian scheme presented in the Catechism? Where is the election of a certain number of mankind to everlasting life set forth as the root and principle of redemption, preceding in the order of nature the predestination of Him by whom it was to be accomplished? Which question is it, that limits the atonement to the range of this election, making it to have no reference to others, in spite of what is said of the Saviour's sufferings

as a sort of appendix "naturally growing out of the doctrine of the church." This of itself is enough to show, that it is nowhere to be found directly and explicitly in the Catechism itself; for no one will pretend that it lies in this question, otherwise at best than by remote theological involution, or that the question is not easily capable of being so taken as to avoid entirely the idea of absolutely unconditional decrees. On the fall of man, quest. 7, he distinctly rejects the supralapsarian view, making Adam's sin to have been the object only of God's foreknowledge, which did not involve the necessity of what actually took place.

in Quest. 37, as being of vicarious force, in body and soul, for "the sins of *all mankind*?" Where is it taught that grace is irresistible, or that the issue of it is not conditioned by the human will? What question affirms the absolute predestination of a given portion of the human race to perdition? Where is the doctrine of the decrees directly defined or asserted in any shape?

These are some of the *hard points*, which we say the Heidelberg Catechism has taken care to avoid; and Dr. Proudfit's rhodomontade to the contrary is worth just nothing at all, till he shall condescend to come to the written text of the formula itself, and quote question and line in proof of his bold contradictions. His course, in the whole matter, is by no means honorable and fair. It is very well known, that these hard points of Calvinism have been of more or less fluctuating authority, for the general system so called, from the beginning. In the Synod of Dort itself, the supralapsarian hypothesis could not stand.* And what a tendency there is with our Calvinistic bodies generally in these latter days, to mollify greatly, if not absolutely to throw away, much that belongs to the system in its full metaphysical glory, is on all sides sufficiently clear and well understood. We seriously question, indeed, whether even Dr. Proudfit himself is prepared deliberately to subscribe to all the "thorny dialectic subtleties" now in consideration—supralapsarianism for instance, and an atonement for a part of the human family only and not for the whole. And yet he falls upon our assertion that the Heidelberg Catechism avoids these subtleties

* Speaking of the beginning of the 17th century, (Eccl. Hist. sect II, part II, chap. II), Mosheim tells us: "There was not any public law or confession of faith that obliged the pastors of the Reformed churches, in any part of the world to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that were adopted and taught at Geneva. And accordingly there were many, who either rejected entirely the doctrine of that academy on these intricate points, or received it with certain restrictions and modifications. Nay, even those who were in general attached to the theological system of Geneva, were not perfectly agreed about the manner of explaining the doctrine relating to the divine decrees. The greatest part were of opinion, that God had only *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression, without positively *predetermining* his fall. But others went much farther, and presumptuously forgetting their own ignorance on the one hand and the wisdom and equity of the divine counsels on the other, maintained that God, in order to exercise and display his awful justice and his free mercy had decreed from all eternity the transgression of Adam; and so ordered the course of events, that our first parents could not possibly avoid their unhappy fall."

and knotty points, as though it were tantamount at once to saying, that it has nothing to do with the Calvinistic system in any shape; over against which false accusation, (a mere man of straw thus set up by himself,) he then proceeds to fight lustily, with notes of admiration and other such artillery, till he has to his own satisfaction fairly demolished it, proving effectually that Ursinus was no Pelagian, and that his Catechism is not guilty of "Laodicean latitudinarianism" on the doctrines of grace! As if there were no intermediate ground to be thought of now in the case, between the formal teaching of the extreme points of Calvinism, and a lukewarm indifference to the proper evangelical substance of the system! What then are we to make of the Augsburg Confession? What must we think of Melancthon, not to speak of Luther himself the great coryphaeus of the Reformation? Must the whole Lutheran theology be branded as Pelagian and Laodicean, because it refuses the hard points of Geneva? So it would seem, with *a fortiori* consequence, from Dr. Proudfit's logic; for this theology positively disowns, in the case of some of these intricate knots, what the Heidelberg Catechism at worst but passes over with modest and discreet silence.

We cherish all proper regard for the Reformed Dutch church, and have no wish to abridge in the least its right to carry out the Calvinistic scheme in its own way; but we must earnestly protest, at the same time, against every attempt to convert this liberty into a yoke for the neck of the German church, such as from the beginning it has never yet been willing to accept or bear. The two bodies are closely related in their past history, and have much of a common genius, the kindly sense of which may not soon be extinguished, we sincerely trust, on either side.¹ But with all this they are not now, and never have been of just the same theological constitution and complexion. On the high points of Calvinism, in particular, the German Reformed church has always refused to go even so far as the Belgic Confession or the Decrees of the Synod of Dort, and much less to the *ultima*

¹ This ecclesiastical consanguinity is often recognized, and pleasingly acknowledged, in the peculiar sort of home feeling, which the delegates of one body experience when taking part in the synodical sessions and proceedings of the other. On the Dutch side the relationship is best understood, in the nature of the case, by the true Dutch element still found in that church; as distinguished from the large infusion of foreign life, (more or less Puritanic,) which has already gone far to undermine the old spirit.

thule of supralapsarian predestination.* The platform of our faith here is wide and free. If any choose to be extreme predestinationists, they have full liberty to follow their particular inclination. But they are not allowed to narrow the platform itself to any such tight measure. Any attempt to do so, would be met at once by an overwhelming protest, from all parts of the church. There is a difference here between the Dutch and German churches, with all their close historical relationship, which it is very important always to bear in mind; a difference that grows mainly out of another relationship on the German side; that, namely, which this bears at the same time to confessional Lutheranism. It is not easy to understand or feel the full force of this, (as we have learned experimentally) without

* See on the character of the German Reformed church, and its relation to Lutheranism and Calvinism, an interesting article by Dr. H. HERR, published in Ullmann's *Studien und Kritiken*, July 1850. With Calvin, the absolute decree forms the generative principle of all theology. His system turns on it as a pivot, from beginning to end, in a way intrinsically fatal at last even to his own doctrine of the sacraments. The Reformed Confessions generally, as we have before seen, were not willing to follow it out to its proper metaphysical end. "Almost all of them," according to Heppe, "take the *infralapsarian* view, (which cuts the life-nerve of Calvin's system,) and at the Synod of Dort, Gomar found himself, with his supralapsarian theory, in the position almost of a separatist. Only three Confessions present Calvin's dogma in its pure grain, the *Consensus of Geneva*, the *Helvetic Formula* of 1675, and the *Westminster Confession* of the Puritans. The first was not subscribed probably even by Zurich, among all the other Swiss churches. The second must be regarded as a posthumous work of the schools, which in a very short time passed into practical oblivion. So that neither the one nor the other document is of any force in evidence of what was the reigning consciousness of the Reformed church; and the Westminster Confession remains thus the *only* symbol of full predestinarianism,—proof enough, that such Calvinism, arraying itself against the idea of a historical and sacramental church and resolving all into the *decretum Dei absolutum*, carries in it no proper power of life." But now in direct opposition to the abstract principle of Calvinism, the German Reformation roots itself from the start in the historical and objective idea of the church. Out of this grew the Melancthonian tendency as one side of the general movement, over against high Lutheranism as we have it in the Form of Concord: the result of which was the German Reformed church, established as a common interest in the Palatinate, in Hesse, and in Brandenburg. This was Calvinistic in its sacramental doctrine, and fell in more or less with Calvinism also at other points; but it never gave up its distinctively German construction of theology. The Elector Frederick most distinctly professed to abide always by the Augsburg Confession, and the doctrinal views of Melancthon. The Heidelberg Catechism is *historiologically* constructed, and follows Melancthon's method and spirit throughout. Of predestination in the Calvinistic sense, we hear not a word. Such, we say, is the view taken of the whole case, in this article by Heppe.

being in the bosom of the German Reformed church itself, and sharing in its actual theological life. No other branch of the Reformed church in this country can be said to understand Lutheranism, or to have any natural ecclesiastical sympathy with its proper genius and soul.* Now this affinity we have just as little right to ignore or forget, as we have to lose sight of the other. When the sense of it is lost, the constitutional life of the German Reformed church will be also at an end. Let the Dutch church understand this. Our Calvinism is not just that of the Synod of Dort; and we are not willing to admit of course, in the face of all past history, that the Heidelberg Catechism must be rigorously construed by any such rule. In all this however we quarrel not with the Dutch church, which has full right certainly, as we have said before, to carry out her confessional system in her own way; all we ask is, that the German church may be considered free also to stop short here, as she has ever done, with the simple text of the Catechism itself, leaving the hard points that lie beyond without symbolical determination, for theology to solve and settle afterwards as it best can.

It only remains, to notice briefly the criticism bestowed by Dr. Proudfit on Mr. Williard's translation itself. We have had no opportunity to compare this with the original text, and can therefore say nothing positively as to the ability and fidelity with which it has been executed. But it is easy enough to see, from the face of such evidence as we have before us, that the general criticism of the Brunswick Professor is exceedingly unfair.

He affects to call in question the worth and sufficiency of Mr. Williard's Latin text, (the Geneva edition of 1616) without any good reason that we can see whatever. He takes the translator solemnly to task, at the same time, for venturing out of his copy, in a few instances, to bring in short extracts from the "old English translation by Parry;" although these extracts, (three in number, we believe, and amounting in all to perhaps two pages of matter,) are carefully noted in the text itself as *addenda*, with

*It is remarkable, that no other Reformed church, (if we are rightly informed,) keeps up any ecclesiastical correspondence with any part of the Lutheran body in this country. A high wall of separation is made thus to shut out this whole confessional interest, which is yet glorified again in history, when it suits, as the main wing of the Reformation. What is thus excluded too, is especially the idea of Lutheranism in its true original shape. By giving up its own glorious confessional life, the system (then known as "*American Lutheranism*") propitiates indeed some Puritan favor; but it falls at the same time into the predicament of a characterless Pelagian sect, with which no church fellowship is to be desired.

due warning given of the fact besides in the Preface. In these extracts some alterations are made in Parry's antiquated style, "to adapt it to the taste," Mr. Williard says, "of the modern reader." Now only hear Professor Proudfit on this point: "In this practice, we must remind him that he has departed from all the just principles which ought to guide a translator. We cannot well conceive a larger 'liberty,' than for a translator to 'insert short extracts' from unknown sources, changing the style and construction so as to adapt it to the *taste* of the modern reader!" The word *taste* italicised, to convey the perfectly gratuitous and we will add *ungentlemanly* insinuation, that the case may include some theological accommodation, instead of the mere fashion of language, the actual "foisting in" of a new sense with sinister purpose and regard.¹ Miserable balderdash!

But there are instances not a few of bad translation in the book, according to our critic. We can only say, not having the original at hand, that the book does not read like a bad translation; on the contrary it runs very clearly and smoothly, more so than translations do commonly, and makes at all events very good sense. Dr. Proudfit quotes a few specimens in proof of his charge; but they are after all of no very considerable account; and we know not how far they may be attributable to variations in the original text. We pretend not however to say that the translation is exempt from errors. That could hardly be expected in the first edition of so large a work. All we wish to say is, that Dr. Proudfit's criticism here is chargeable with gross exaggeration.

So as regards the typographical and general editorial execution of the work. It is declared to be unpardonably negligent and inaccurate! This accusation at least, we feel at liberty bluntly to contradict. Typographical errors may indeed be found; but they certainly need some hunting. They are not at once patent. Pages need to be gone over, somewhat microscopically too in many cases, to find them. Then as for the general style of the book, it may easily enough be left to speak for itself; as it has already in truth won in its own favor, on all sides, the highest commendation and praise. Seldom do we meet with a religious

¹ It is a little queer, that one ground of offence with Williard's work at first in a certain quarter, we are told, was that it did not contain a portion of matter found in Parry's book, which is not from Ursinus at all. The omission was set down for a wilful *suppressio veri*, and evidence of a dreadful conspiracy with Mercersburg to murder the proper life of the Heidelberg Catechism!

work of like size, for common popular use, in the case of which the outward costume both of paper and type is less open to any fair reproach.

But three whole questions, the 84th, 85th and 95th, are left out altogether; "the exposition meanwhile jogging on, as if quite unconscious that it had parted company with the text." Nine readers out of ten, we presume, would infer from the way in which this is brought forward by Dr. Proudfit, that these questions were dropped, commentary and all, (the fault perhaps of Mr. Williard's bad Latin copy,) while the worthy translator nevertheless went straight ahead with his work, having no sense seemingly of the *hiatus valde defendendus*, by which these parts of the catechetical text were thus summarily annihilated! But what is the actual amount of the ominous omission in the end? Why this simply, that these three questions themselves do not appear in their proper place, at the head of the sections or chapters of exposition to which they belong; while in truth no part whatever of the exposition itself is broken or wanting in any way. It all comes thus to an easily intelligible oversight of the press, which is a blemish certainly for this first impression of the work, but by no means such a damning sin as it might appear to be from the ambiguous form of Dr. Proudfit's charge.

It is plain enough after all, however, that the criticism of Mr. Williard's work forms but a small part of the real object of Dr. Proudfit's article; the main purpose of it is to assail the Mordecai-sitting at the gate, our Introduction namely on the life and character of Ursinus. In what spirit, and with what sort of effect, this has been done, we have now tried to make in some measure apparent. The article is sufficiently ostentatious and ambitious; it is ushered in with quite a historical dissertation on the subject of catechetical instruction, abounds in sophomorical scraps of Latin, (the author being a professor of the dead languages,) and makes a wonderful parade throughout of doing up its work in a smashing wholesale way. But in all this there is a great deal more show than substance. The historical introduction is but little to the point; the sophomorical scraps of Latin prove nothing; and what affects to be smashing argument resolves itself, on near inspection, into empty smoke or something worse. The argument consists for the most part in creating false issues, by pushing qualified statements out to an extreme sense, by exaggerating and caricaturing points of controversy, in one word by setting up men of straw; over whom an easy victory is gained, the weight of which is then pompously employed to crush what has been thus misrepresented and abused. Dr.

Proudfit finds it an easy task to show that the Heidelberg Catechism has no sympathy with Romanism, is not made up of unintelligible mystification, and falls in with the general Augustinian theory of salvation in opposition to every sort of Pelagianism; and this he plays off as an overwhelming contradiction to our statement, that the Catechism stands pre-eminent among Reformed or Calvinistic symbols for its catholic historical spirit, for its sense of the mystical interest in religion in connection with the intellectual, and for its moderation and reserve in not urging the Calvinistic system to its metaphysical extremes. The logic certainly is both easy and cheap.

We are glad to understand, that the first edition of Mr. Williard's book is already off his hands, and that the demand for it is such as to call for a second. The circulation is of course so far mainly within the German church. It would be a pity if the present *Introduction* merely should stand in the way of its being favorably received in the Reformed Dutch church, as Dr. Proudfit seems to think it should and must do. We beg leave therefore to suggest a simple remedy for the evil. Let a separate edition be engaged for the special use of this venerable sister denomination, carefully revised and with the *Introduction* left out. Or if preferred, let *another* *Introduction* be drawn up, either by Dr. Proudfit himself or by somebody else, calculated for the meridian of New Brunswick, and conformed in all respects theologically to the reigning Puritan standard of the present time. Let it roundly affirm, that on the subject of the decrees the formal teaching of the Heidelberg Catechism falls not a whit behind the determinations of the Synod of Dort, that it owns no sympathy whatever with the catholic ideas of the ancient church, that it eschews religiously the whole mystical interest in religion and moves only in the sphere of the logical understanding, that it has in it no inward relationship whatever to Lutheranism, that the true key to its sense and spirit should be sought rather in New England Puritanism, that it is unchurchly and unsacramental throughout, acknowledging no objective grace, no mystery at all, (just as little, be it whispered, as Art. XXXV of the *Belgic Confession*,) in the holy sacraments, on a full par thus with the universal sectarian rationalism of the day. Let this be the standpoint, we say, of the new *Introduction*, got up for the special use and benefit of the Reformed Dutch church; and if the Dutch church generally should choose to be satisfied with it, the world at large, we presume, will not feel it necessary to make any objection.

J. W. N.

LATIN PRONUNCIATION.

Elements of Latin Pronunciation, for the use of Students in Language, Law, Medicine, Zoology, Botany, and the Sciences generally in which Latin words are used. By S. S. HALDEMAN, A. M., Professor of Natural History in the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co. 1851. 12mo., pp. 76.

THOSE of us students in Pennsylvania, who were inducted into the rudiments of the Latin Language some thirty years ago, well remember with what care we were taught our proper pronunciation. As one of the fundamental maxims it was laid down to us in the Grammar of Dr. Ross, which we learned by heart, that an Anglicized pronunciation of Latin must be cautiously avoided. The observance of this injunction, however, at any rate, so far as the letters were concerned, we were pleased to find, was not very difficult. The learned shibboleth, upon which we soon began to pride ourselves, consisted in the proper enunciation of two vowels, A and E. The sounds of the other letters coincided mostly with those of the English; but *a* we were constantly enjoined to pronounce *ah*, as heard in the English word *far*, and *e*, *aye*, as heard in the English word *prey* or *there*, without any variations. This, in those blissful days, we supposed to be the general custom in all learned nations. What was our astonishment then, soon afterwards, in coming in contact with New England grammars, which have long since, we are almost sorry to say it, in a great measure superseded in Pennsylvania our beloved Ross's, to find it laid down among other extenuating rules that *a* and *e*, when at the end of an accented syllable, must be pronounced as the same vowels in the same positions in English. Of *pá-ter* and *dé-dít*, for instance, the first syllables must be uttered with the same sounds as those in the English words, *fatal* and *metre*. "Oh, what a fall was there, my countrymen!" We could not succumb to it. We were constrained to admit that in many particulars these new grammars were in advance of our old favorite's, especially in the syntax, but we could not give up our superior pronunciation. We felt as proud of it as did the old Seceder lady, of whom we have somewhere heard, when asked to tell the difference between the tenets of her own church and those of the Presbyterian. "Difference!" she exclaimed. "And dinna ye ken the difference! Why 'tis awfu'; as you yoursel' would easily ken did ye but come and hear ane o' our learned ministers frae the

pulpit—Yours o' the ither kirk, in the Bible when they come to the word, Mesopotamia, aye say it in a finified way: Mesopotá-mia; but ours o' the orthodox faith, when they come to it, aye fling open their mou's braidly and spak it out: Mesopotáh-miah, wi' a heavenly sound."

Having stated to a learned New England teacher, a few years ago, my predilection for this mode of pronunciation he expressed his utter astonishment that a man of my taste, as he was pleased to say, would wish to ever sanction any Scotch Irish intonations in the refined language of ancient Rome. I reminded him, however, as my more extended philological reading had then enabled me, that this sublime, sonorous pronunciation of the vowels *a* and *e* was not at all restricted to any dialect of Scotland or Ireland, as he himself well knew, but that it was to be heard also at the present day in almost all the polished languages on the continent of Europe.

"Granting this to be a fact," he replied, "it follows not thence certainly that in our country these two vowels should be uttered as they are in those foreign lands, in our Latin. The ancient pronunciation of this language having, in a great measure, been lost, you are well aware that in different modern nations the learned have accommodated the sounds in its letters and syllables as far as possible to similar ones of their own. As then in these United States the English Language prevails, it certainly becomes us to pronounce our Latin according to the English usage."

"I admit," said I, "that the English is the prevailing speech in our country; but does this form any insuperable bar, in case the mode of pronunciation on the continent of Europe accords best with the genius of the ancient Latin Language, to our adopting it generally in our classical reading and speaking?"

"Oh," cried he, "I perceive that your wishes are not limited. You are pleading, it seems, for a foreign enunciation not only of your two favorite vowels but of the whole alphabet! You would fain introduce into our American Latin an Italian or German pronunciation not only of *a* and *e* but of all the other vowels, diphthongs and consonants!"

"Not introduce," said I, "if you please, but extend its use; as in some of our best Literary Institutions, you are well aware, it has long since been introduced. As this pronunciation is, in a manner, lineally descended from the ancient Latin, and it certainly comes nearer to the original, would it not be well to use it generally in all our classical schools and colleges?"

What reply he made to this suggestion I do not now remem-

ber; but I feel persuaded that, in the end, I came off decidedly the better in the argument. Here I would have rested on my laurels, being satisfied; but since I have met with some who would fain carry this reform still higher. Even in Italy, they say, some of the letters have deviated considerably from their ancient sounds; and would it not be well, they ask, by ascertaining this and adopting the earliest mode of expressing them, to approach in our Latin reading as near as possible to the original? To those I would reply: 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished.' As the Latin letters too were, in all likelihood, phonetic, retaining in all positions the same sounds, being varied only in length, were these once fully ascertained and settled, their pronunciation would be easy. Of reviving their old sounds the greatest difficulty in the way, however, would be modern custom and prejudice. It is hard to overcome old habits. As, for instance, to adduce one case out of several, in nearly all Europe, as is well known, in Latin the letter *c* before *e*, *i*, *y*, *ae* or *oe*, is pronounced like our English *s*, but, in all other positions, like *k*; whereas with the ancient Romans it had always the force of the last mentioned guttural. Could we, however, with all our love for ancient usage, be easily brought back to the earliest mode of expression, and, in reading the classics, say *Kike-ro* for *Cicero*, *kircum* for *circum*, &c? In English we are familiar with so many words derived from the Latin in all of which the *c*, as above located, has this sibilant sound that our modern ears, we fancy, could hardly be brought to hear with pleasure their primitives in Latin pronounced otherwise.

Be this as it may, we feel persuaded, however, that no student in the Latin can be thorough without a knowledge of its ancient pronunciation. Only in this way can he arrive at an apprehension of its etymology, which is so essential to the proper understanding of a language. By restoring words to their ancient sounds he will at once be struck by close and beautiful relationships and resemblances between them and others, which he had never before suspected; and these too by no means confined to the Latin, but often existing between them and others in other languages. In this way too, as can easily be perceived, the study becomes of vast account in the researches of the ethnologist. Hitherto this subject has been kept, in a great measure, out of view. Our modern grammarians make no mention of it. As some of our theologians care little about ancient creeds or of looking too narrowly into ecclesiastical history lest it might unsettle some of their favorite dogmas, so many of our grammarians care not much about making any allusion to the ancient

powers of the letters lest it might disturb the faith of students in their present, approved, national modes of pronouncing Latin. We trust this little work of Prof. Haldeman may serve to awaken a deeper interest in the subject. That philosophical talent and tact so essential for investigations in natural science, which he is well known eminently to possess, he has here brought to bear on the elements of the Latin Language with peculiar success. His conclusions, we fancy, are generally, if not always, correct, as they are founded on philosophical principles, having been drawn from various reliable materials both ancient and modern, in a manner almost as satisfactory and as safely to be trusted as the deductions of mathematics. These, in most cases, agree with those of other eminent philologists, but in some they are entirely new. Thus has he furnished a work which was much wanted in our country; a cheap, convenient manual of only seventy-six pages, duodecimo, embracing the results of deep research, which no student of the ancient languages or indeed of any of the sciences in which Latin words are used, should ever be without.

Mercersburg, Pa.

W. M. N.

SYSTEMATIC BENEVOLENCE.¹

Lev. xxvii: 30-32.

Ex. xxx: 13-16.

1 Cor. xvi: 1-2.

Act. xx: 35.

BENEVOLENCE is a necessary manifestation of *love*, which, as the product of a living faith, constitutes the cardinal virtue of Christianity, the fulfilment of the whole moral law. You might as well separate the sun from light and heat, as love from charity and benevolence. Faith without works is dead, so is love without acts of charity. The Apostle calls upon us to love, not with words or with the tongue only, but "in deed and in truth." All that we are and that we possess, as natural men and as regenerate christians, we owe to the free mercy of God, our Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier, and we are therefore bound, by the most sacred of obligations, to love Him in return by keeping His commandments. We have no right to live, unless we live for the glory of God and for the good of our fellow men. It is only in this way, that we can secure true happiness on earth and eternal bliss in heaven.

Our first and principal duty is to consecrate our *lives*, our persons and services to the Lord, who gave Himself for us. Our second duty which is already involved in the first, requires us to devote our *property* and our *possessions* to the Lord. But how shall this be done? We cannot give our money directly to Him, nor does He need it. Still we give it to Him by giving it to His cause, to the furtherance of His kingdom in the world, and to the promotion of every good work connected with His glory and the salvation of men. Yea, even a drink of water offered to the lowliest of His disciples in time of need, He will regard as offered to Himself, and reward it openly on the great day of account. For He identifies His cause in condescending love with the cause of His people, and if we serve the church, which is His body, in the proper spirit and from pure motives, we serve Him and promote His glory, while we at the same time realize the end of our being and secure the salvation of our immortal soul.

¹ A Sermon preached by appointment before the Synod of the German Reformed Church of the U. S., at Lancaster, Pa., on the 20th of October, 1851, and published by request of the Synod.

Benevolence ought, however, not to be looked upon merely as a duty, but at the same time as a *pleasure* and *privilege*. "It is more blessed," says Christ, "to give than to receive." God is love, and as such the fountain of all bliss. All His works are manifestations of His love, whose nature consists in self-communication, in going out of itself and entering into its object. He delights in creating, preserving, redeeming and perfecting man, formed in His image, and in pouring upon him His choicest blessings, yea in making him a partaker of His own glory. The more we love, the more godlike and happy we become. He who does not give cheerfully, but merely from a feeling of duty or from outward compulsion, has not yet the gospel-spirit and denies himself the sweetest and purest enjoyment. As selfishness is the principle of sin and the source of all misery, so its opposite, love to God and man, is the principle of holiness and the fountain of true happiness.

The *objects* of christian benevolence are, the maintenance and promotion of virtue and religion at home and abroad, and the support of the poor. To provide for these objects it is of the greatest importance to follow a certain *method* or *system*. God is a God of order, in all His works and ways. Order and regularity are the secret of success in every line of business. Why is it that certain denominations, whose membership mostly belong to the middle and poorer classes of society, contribute such large sums annually for the benevolent operations of the Church, whilst other denominations of equally sound doctrine, of as much piety in other respects, and of greater wealth contribute much less? Why can the Moravians and the Methodists, for instance, support so many ministers and missionaries at home and abroad? Why can the Roman Catholics build such costly cathedrals and establish so many charitable institutions? Because they pursue a regular system of benevolence and train all their members to give, however small the individual donations may be. A great many rivulets make a large stream, and a large quantity of small stones an imposing building. The comparatively slow progress and languishing condition of most of the benevolent operations in the German Churches of this country, is greatly, if not altogether, owing to the want of such a general system of co-operation. A few of our liberal members have thus far carried nearly the whole burden of our general enterprises, whilst perhaps the majority have done little or nothing towards any of them.

It is said sometimes, that the German population are constitutionally illiberal and close. But this is refuted by facts. Fran-

ke's Orphan House at Halle and many similar institutions founded by the Pietists in Württemberg, are to be numbered amongst the brightest monuments of active benevolence. The Moravian Society is of German origin and complexion, and history hardly furnishes an equal number of Christians of any creed, who in proportion to their means have shown so much liberality and self-sacrifice in the work of missions. The German mind and character has abundantly proven itself to be capable of the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice, in almost every department of intellectual and moral activity; why should it not be equally capable of consecrating its perishing earthly treasures to the cause of truth, virtue and religion? If we succeed in training our churches to a regular system of benevolence, we shall have no difficulty in supporting our pastors, in building churches, in founding parochial schools, academies, colleges and seminaries of theology, in educating pious young men for the ministry of the gospel, in providing for the poor and the needy, and in doing our mite towards carrying the innumerable blessings of Christianity to the uttermost parts of the world.

The subject of *systematic benevolence* then is of no small importance to us at this time, and closely connected with all our interests, with our external and internal prosperity as a branch of the church of Jesus Christ. I do not flatter myself that I shall do justice at all to this subject in the remarks which I intend to offer, on this occasion, at the request of Synod, or be able to propose a plan which may give entire satisfaction to our ministers and laymen. But I hope, I may at least succeed in spreading some light and in suggesting some ideas, which may be of service in the synodical discussion on the subject, and in the formation of that scheme of benevolence which may finally be agreed upon for the benefit of our beloved Zion. Believing that the word of God and the history of His church are, as in every thing connected with religion, so also in this respect our best and only sure guides, I shall speak first of the *Jewish* system of liberality as established by Jehovah Himself in the Old Testament; secondly of the liberality of the early *Christian* Church; and in the third place make the practical application of the lessons of revelation and of history to our *present* circumstances in our *German Churches of America*. It is expected that the last part should be made most prominent, in view of the practical purpose before us. The limits of a sermon, however, will of course, only permit me, to present the subject in its general outlines.

I. Systematic Benevolence amongst the Jews.

In the Old Testament dispensation, God had ordained a fixed rule for the exercise of benevolence.

1. He prescribed three kinds of regular taxes for the support of religion.

a. In the first place he required of the Jews, who were originally all possessed of real property, the *tenth part* of all the produce of the soil and the herd, or the corresponding value in money, for the support of the priesthood. "And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the Lord's; it is holy unto the Lord. And if a man will at all redeem ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth part thereof. And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the Lord," Lev. 27: 30-32; comp. Num. 18: 21-26; Deut. xiv: 22-27; Nehem. x: 37-39. This tithe, like all other tributes, the Jews were properly to give to the Lord Himself, and He then made it over, as a heritage, to the Levites, who had no real property, Num. xviii: 24. The Levites again had to give the tithe of this tithe to the Priests, Num. xviii: 26ff; Nehem. x: 38. This institution was not originated, but only improved and developed by the Mosaic law. We find phrases of it already at an earlier period in the days of Abraham, who offered the tenth of his conquest to Melchisedec, the mysterious priest of the most high God (Gen. xiv: 20; Heb. vii: 2.). Yea even amongst heathen nations the custom prevailed, to consecrate to some god or goddess the tenth part of the produce of the soil, of the industrial gain and the spoils of war, as we learn from Herodotus, Xenophon, Pausanias, Plutarchus, Plinius, Macrobius, Tustinus and other ancient writers. This fact proves, how natural such an institution was and how easily it fell in with the general religious wants of humanity.

b. In the second place, the Israelites were required to offer to the Lord a part of the *first fruits* of all the agricultural produce, raw as well as prepared for human use, (such as wheat, fruits of trees, grapes, cider, oil, flour,) before they made use of the rest, Ex. xxiii: 19; Num. xviii: 12f; Deut. xxvi: 2ff; Nehem. x: 33, etc. These offerings were eaten by the priests, (Deut. xviii: 3f; Ezech. xxxiv: 30f;) their measure and number, however, was not prescribed, but left to the free will of the individual. In addition to this, the whole nation, in order to show their gratitude for the blessing of harvest, used to bring on each Passover a sheaf of the first fruits, and on each Pentecost two

wave-loaves of two tenth-deals, with animal offerings, to the priest as a sacrifice unto the Lord, Lev. xxiii : 10-20.

c. The third regular tribute was intended for the support of the national sanctuary, first the *tabernacle* and afterwards the *temple* of Jerusalem. Every Israelite of twenty years and above was obliged to give annually for this object *half a shekel*, or a didrachma, i. e. a silver coin of thirty cents value, Exod. xxx : 13ff; 2 Chron. xxiv : 6; Matth. xvii : 24-27.

These were the ordinary taxes which had to be paid by all the Jews, even by those who lived out of Palestine, for the maintenance and promotion of the O. T. religion.

2. The second object of benevolence, the support of the *poor*, who are found in every nation and under the best form of government, was very wisely provided for by the Mosaic law. To them was left an after harvest on the fields, olive-yards and vineyards, Lev. xix : 9, 10; Deut. xxiv : 19-21. Moreover in the sabbath year, that is in every seventh year, when the soil was not cultivated, the poor, the widows, the orphans and the strangers had free access to all that grew spontaneously in the fields and in vineyards, Lev. xxv : 5, 6; and they were to be invited besides to the meals of tithe, which took place every three years before the dwelling of every citizen, Deut. xiv : 28f, xxvi : 12-14. Finally, the year of jubilee, i. e. every fiftieth year, restored the equality, renewed the whole theocracy and returned to destitute Israelites the lost possession of their family property, Lev. xxv : 8-17-39-41; xxvii : 17ff.

If we add to these regular gifts of benevolence the voluntary deeds of charity, and the extraordinary contributions for particular occasions, such as the building of the temple and of synagogues, we may suppose that many a pious Jew gave not less than the fourth or even the third part of his annual income to the Lord. Of Zacchæus, who was, however, already touched by the spirit of the gospel, which ought to make men still more liberal than the law, we learn Luke xix : 8, that he gave even the half of his goods to the poor, and was willing, if he had taken any thing from any man unjustly, to restore it to him four fold. And yet this was no loss, but a gain and a blessing. In proportion to their faithfulness in the discharge of these duties, the nation prospered externally and internally. "Honor the Lord with thy substance and with the first fruits of all thine increase : So shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine," Prov. iii : 9, 10. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal

soul shall be made fat, and he that watereth shall be watered also himself," Prov. xi : 24, 25. "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given, will He pay him again," Prov. xix : 17, (cp. Ps. xxxi : 2-4, Ps. 112 : 5-9, Tob. iv : 11; xii : 9.) The same law of divine reward is expressed also in the New Test. by our Saviour Himself: "Give and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down and shaken together and running over, shall men give unto your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again," Luke vi : 38.

The care and administration of those legal and voluntary sacrifices was entrusted to special curators, and thirteen chests called "trumpets" on account of their shape, were placed in the outer court of the temple for their reception, 2 Chr. xxxi : 11, 12, Nehem. x : 38, 39. There the pious widow in the gospel deposited her mite, Marc. xii : 41ff. Besides every synagogue had a chest for the poor, into which two men deposited the collected alms, and out of these every poor man of the congregation received as much on the eve of the sabbath, as he needed for the following week.

II. Systematic Benevolence in the Primitive Church.

1. In the *New Testament* we have no passage, by which this Jewish system of benevolence is either expressly confirmed or abrogated. But the Saviour points out in a general way His relation to the Old Testament dispensation which may be applied also to the case in hand. He declares in the sermon of the mount, Matth. v : 17, that His mission was not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them. The whole Mosaic law is indeed abolished in a certain sense, namely in its national and temporal form and as a killing letter, but in its spirit and essence it is confirmed, sharpened, deepened and brought to perfection by Jesus Christ, theoretically as well as practically, by His perfect doctrine and by His sinless holy life. He delivered us from the curse of the law, fulfilled it by His active and passive obedience, and gives us by his Holy Spirit and example the power to fulfil it also. Concerning the duty of charity and liberality in particular, we cannot for a moment suppose that it should have lost any of its force and extent in the N. T. dispensation, on the contrary it has increased in proportion to the increase of grace. If already the Jews, in the moon-light of the O. T. revelation, were required to manifest so much gratitude,

how much more must be expected from christians, in the midst of the full splendor of the sun of the gospel and that perfect revelation of love, which God has made in His only begotten Son? The greater the blessing bestowed upon us, the greater the gratitude required from us.

This inference from the general spirit of our holy religion is confirmed, by the actual condition of the Apostolical congregations. We find that the early christians, in the ardor of their first love and the fresh enjoyment of the unspeakable goodness of their Saviour, manifested a spirit of self-denial and benevolence, which far surpasses the Old Testament examples. The congregation of Jerusalem went so far as to introduce a voluntary community of goods; the rich members, in literal fulfilment of the commandment of Christ, Luke xii: 33, sold their possessions and laid the price at the Apostles' feet, for the benefit of the poor and suffering, Acts ii: 45, iv: 34-37. In the other congregations, where this system could not be carried out, there was at least the same spirit of self-denying love and beneficence, that true christian communism which,—without abolishing the difference of riches and poverty in a political point of view, and without destroying the variety of life according to the abstract theories and impracticable dreams of modern pseudo-reformers,—equalizes this difference from within, and makes both wealth and poverty subservient to high moral ends. The example of Tabitha, who provided for the clothing of widows and orphans with the labor of her own hand (Acts ix: 36), was certainly not isolated in the Apostolic church, but only a manifestation of its general spirit. When a famine broke out in Palestine, a. 44, all the disciples in Antioch contributed to the relief of their brethren according to their means (Acts xi: 29). The apostle Paul was especially concerned, in the midst of his many labors, to provide for his suffering fellow christians, and ordered collections to be taken up weekly in the Greek churches, for the benefit of the poor Jewish converts in Palestine, as we see from 1 Cor. xvi: 1, 2, a passage which will claim our more particular attention in the third part. He gives special praise in this respect to the christians in Macedonia, who, although comparatively poor themselves, did their utmost for the relief of their distant brethren in the faith.

We have no particular account of the way and method, by which the apostolical congregations supported their pastors and teachers. The Lord Himself, however, and St. Paul inculcates on several occasions (Matth x: 11, Luke x: 7, 8, 1 Cor. ix: 6-14, 1 Tim. v: 17, Gal. vi: 6,) the self-evident, although fre-

quently forgotten principle, that the laborer is worthy of his hire, and that the minister of the gospel is perfectly entitled to his temporal support from the congregation, to which he communicates the eternal blessings of the kingdom of heaven. By doing this, the people simply discharge a sacred duty of gratitude to God and His servants. It is very probable, yea almost certain, that the christians of Jewish descent adhered to the old custom of devoting the tithes and the first fruits to the support of religion; for as we know, they continued conscientiously to observe the whole moral and ceremonial law till the destruction of Jerusalem, without, however, imposing the same burden upon their brethren of heathen origin, (Acts xv: 28, 29). At all events, from the scattered hints of the N. Test., we must form a very high opinion of the liberality and self-denying love of the primitive churches, particularly if we take into consideration their general poverty, the many persecutions and consequent losses to which they were subjected, the numerous missionary travels of the apostles, of their delegates and co-laborers, the greater part of whom could no doubt apply to themselves the words of St. Peter: "Silver and gold have I none" (Acts iii: 6.), and who were consequently dependent upon the voluntary support of the believers.

2. If we now leave the apostolical period, and cast a glance into the succeeding age of the church, we find, in the *first three centuries* particularly, that self-denying and sacrificing love and benevolence were amongst the most prominent traits of the disciples of Jesus, and formed a most striking contrast to the cold and icy selfishness of the surrounding heathens. It is well known that the latter in the time of *Tertullian*, towards the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, used to exclaim with astonishment: "How the christians love one another, and how they are ready to die for one another!"

They did not confine, however, this love to their brethren in the faith, but, in obedience to the command of Christ (Matth. v: 44,) they exercised it even towards the Pagans and Jews, who persecuted them with slander, fire and sword. In those numerous public calamities, which befell the Roman empire at that time, such as war, famine and pestilence, they took care of the poor, the sick, the prisoners and sufferers of every description, and preached by these deeds, more powerfully than by words, the divine character of their religion. When Northern Africa was visited by a destructive disease, a. 251, and when the heathens at Carthage, from fear of contagion, mercilessly threw the sick and the dying on the highways, in such numbers

that the whole city was threatened with a general infection, the noble-minded bishop *Cyprian* assembled his congregation, and exhorted them, although they had just suffered a bloody persecution, to heap coals of fire on the head of their enemies. "If we," he remarked, "do good only to our own, we do no more, than publicans and heathens; we must, as genuine christians, conquer the evil with good, love our enemies too, as our Lord exhorts us to do, and pray also for our persecutors. As we are born of God, we must, as the children of God, show ourselves worthy of this origin, by imitating our Father's goodness." This appeal was obeyed without delay. Some gave their money, others their labor, and in a short time the dead were all buried and Carthage freed from the danger of destruction. The notorious emperor, *Julian the Apostate*, who after the middle of the fourth century did his best, by all sorts of artifice, although without success, to restore the prostrate heathenism, was found with all his hatred of christianity to acknowledge this trait of benevolence in its professors, and imitated their hospitals and asylums for strangers, in order to bring his beloved idolatry into popular favor. "Let us consider," he said, "that nothing has contributed so much to the progress of the superstition of the Galileans (—thus he contemptuously called the christians—,) as their charity to the poor and to strangers. I think we ought to discharge this obligation ourselves. Establish hospitals in every place. For it is shameful that the heathens assist not even those of their own faith, while the Jews never beg, and the impious Galileans provide not only for their own poor, but also for ours, and thus help the worst cause by a commendable action." Stronger testimony could hardly be desired, than this reluctant confession of a bitter enemy.

From the earliest times, the christians in accordance with the apostolic precept (1 Cor xvi: 1-2) were in the habit of taking up *collections*, in the *weekly services*, for the benefit of the poor, the sick, the widows, the orphans and captives, every one contributing according to his ability and good will. In extraordinary cases, the bishops instituted special collections or fasts, and applied what the people saved by abstinence from food to the relief of near or distant need. The more wealthy congregations of large cities, for instance that of Rome, frequently forwarded pecuniary aid to the most remote regions, particularly for those who were persecuted on account of their faith. About the middle of the third century, Bishop *Cyprian*, with his clergy, raised in a short time over three thousand dollars, to purchase several christians of Numidia from captivity. He transmitted

the gift with an affectionate letter, from which we extract this passage: "The apostle Paul says: As many of you as are baptised, have put on Christ. Therefore we must in our captive brethren behold that Christ, who has purchased us from the danger of captivity, and redeemed us from the danger of death. We must feel constrained to free Him from the hands of the barbarians, who has delivered us from the abyss of Satan, and who now abides and dwells in us; to purchase with a small sum of money Him, who bought us by His cross and blood, and who permits this case of need to occur, in order to try our faith, and to make it appear, whether we are willing to do for others what we would wish to have done to ourselves, if we were kept in bondage by barbarians."

The payment of the *tithes*, the *first fruits* and *oblations* to the ministry, passed from the Jewish theocracy over into the christian church; at first in a free manner as a voluntary sacrifice, afterwards from the sixth century as a legal duty, the neglect of which was followed by certain ecclesiastical, and if necessary, even civil punishments. Most of the church fathers, Irenæus, Origen, Gregory of Nazianz, Chrysostom, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome and others, approve of and recommend this Old Testament institution for imitation, and assert very properly, that the christians should not fall short of the Jews, but ought rather to surpass them in liberality and piety. Ecclesiastical laws, however, requiring the payment of the tithes under punishment of excommunication, are not found before the year 585; and civil laws threatening with legal compulsion began to be introduced at a still later date, in the eighth century under Charlemagne, who himself gave the tithe of all his private possessions and of his Saxon dominions to the church. In Europe this duty of the tithe still exists either wholly or in part in several Roman Catholic and Protestant countries, particularly in England and Sweden, and is kept up by laws of the state; whilst in other countries the secular power at the time of the Reformation, and still more since the first French Revolution, has to a very considerable extent, in England under Henry VIII, in several German states, in France and in Spain, plundered the treasures of the church, heaped up by the piety of former centuries, and stopped or alienated her legal income from its original purpose. In the Oriental churches, it was and is still customary, to devote the tithe as a free gift and religious duty to sacred objects, according to Old Testament example, and in obedience to the recommendations of the early Fathers; but it was never legally introduced amongst them, yea the coercion of the same

by threatening with ecclesiastical punishments was even prohibited by laws.

As it regards the *administration* of legal and voluntary gifts for the cause of religion, they were in the early ages of the church distributed into four portions, under the superintendence of the bishop and his treasurer; the first portion was devoted to the bishop, the second to his clergy, the third to the poor, and the fourth to the support of the religious services and the ecclesiastical buildings. In some countries they made only three portions, and left it to the discretion of the bishop and the clergy, to provide according to circumstances for the relief of the poor, the sick, the stranger, the widows and the orphans.

It would be both interesting and instructive, to follow the history of christian charity and benevolence through the various periods of the church. There we would meet, even in the darkest centuries, particularly also in the little known and much slandered Middle Ages, splendid examples of self-denial and devotion for the cause of religion and humanity, well calculated to fill us with admiration, and to put us to shame. For the history of the church is an uninterrupted chain of proofs, that the Lord, according to His express promise, has not forsaken His people even for a single moment, but has constantly manifested Himself with the fulness of His divine-human life-powers, and expressed in His followers His own love, mercy, compassion and absolute devotion to the glory of God and the welfare of the human race. But an extensive history of benevolence would carry us far beyond the limits of a sermon or a tract, and we must therefore content ourselves, to pass over to our own condition, and enquire, how far and in what manner a regular system of benevolence, according to the instructions of the word of God and of the past history of the church, may be practised in our midst.

To be Continued.

A WORD OF EXPLANATION.

No one will expect us, we presume, to take any notice of the billingsgate expended upon us, in the last number of the Philadelphia Protestant Quarterly, edited by the Rev. Dr. Berg. Like the crackling of thorns under a pot, it has already gone its way into smoke and ashes.

We have no wish to treat with the same contempt an article, which we find directed against us in the January number of the Church Review, the respectable Quarterly of the Episcopal church published at New Haven. It shows itself to be from the hand of one who has some learning, proposes a good and fair object, and though a little rough occasionally in its manner appears to be on the whole sufficiently good natured and free from ugly bigotry and malevolence. But really it goes on such a misapprehension throughout of the drift and purpose of what we have said about the early fathers, that we find no room for honoring it with anything like a formal and regular reply. The idea of the writer seems to be, if we understand him properly, that we have been secretly proposing to stab the credit of these ancient worthies, by showing them to have been the patrons of celibacy, purgatory, veneration for relics and other such like roots and germs of the so called Roman superstition of later times. As the Jesuits in the days of Charles the First are charged with preaching Presbyterianism in England, for the purpose of bringing the cause of Protestantism into bad odor and repute, overshooting thus the *via media* of Anglicanism more out of zeal against it than for it; so in the present case, *mutatis mutandis*, it would appear that we are shrewdly suspected of being after all no better than a capped Puritan, out-Heroding Herod in the matter of church antiquity, only to make the *via media* suspicious again on the contrary side. Anglicanism loves antiquity; but not in too strong doses; holding the principle here, and laying down the maxim, that *too much* even of a good thing is good for nothing. The main object of our learned reviewer is, accordingly, to show in short compass the true value and proper use of the Christian Fathers, whose comfortable repose he thinks in danger of being unsettled and disturbed by the intermeddling of the Mercersburg Review. We cannot say, that the elucidation is very clear or satisfactory. We learn from it, that two extremes are to be religiously avoided; we must not make too little of the fathers, namely, like the universal school of Geneva, and we must not make too much of them, like the

church of Rome. The true happy mean between these errors of too little and too much, is exhibited to us in the better theology of the Anglican church; which having fortunately lighted on the right ecclesiastical scheme in the age of the Reformation, had nothing to do afterwards but to read this faithfully *into* the fathers, so much exactly and no more, in order to understand them as no part of the world ever understood them before.

In justice to the reviewer, it ought perhaps to be added that his strictures are based altogether on the first of our articles on Early Christianity, the second and third not having yet come under his eye. With the whole discussion before him, he could not surely have dreamed that our object was to make the fathers of no authority, by making them apparently to be of too much.

The reviewer however very magisterially charges us with rashness, in what we have said of the Romanizing tenets of the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries. Our allegations, he says, are vague and dictatorial; and we are more familiar, it is intimated, with second hand authorities, than with the *unromanized* editions of the fathers themselves. "No one knows," we are told, "what a regular trade Rome has driven in poisoning the fountains of antiquity, but those who have explored those fountains with cautious and fatiguing diligence"—a task, as this implies, which has been duly performed by our learned deponent himself. But we have seen no evidences as yet to show, that our allegations have been rash. We have found them corroborated at least by very respectable authority, in other quarters. We have not pretended at the same time to any extraordinary personal familiarity with the writings of the fathers; but neither have we felt, nor do we now feel, that this is necessary at all for any such general judgment as that which we have ventured to express; for it is so framed purposely as to take in broad and open facts only, that lie as it were on the surface of history, without depending at all on single texts or controverted readings. The doctrine of *purgatory*, our critic tells us, was not settled before the fourteenth century. And yet, we find it treated in form by Thomas Aquinas, and we know well enough besides that it was of universal force throughout the middle ages; so that it is the rashness of our very learned censor here, "considered as a scholar merely" which rather than our own deserves we think to be regarded as even more than "somewhat wonderful." But we need not come down to the middle ages. Who that has read so much only as Augustine's Confessions needs to be informed, that the practice of praying for the dead was in his time fully established? Or who can require to be told, that this

practice of itself implies the fundamental conception of purgatory, a condition after death which calls for further *purgation* in the case of some before they can come to full rest? It may be said, that the notion of penal suffering in the case was greatly extended in later times. Be it so; that is a matter of controversy which we have purposely avoided. Our allegation regards only the general notion itself; and for the settlement of that, no great amount certainly of patristic lore or criticism is needed. It is perfectly plain that the article of purgatory, so far as the primary conception of it is concerned, was in full vogue in the days of Augustine and Chrysostom; and that the faith of that period was accordingly in full contradiction here, as well as at other points not a few, to the whole system of modern Protestantism, whether Anglican or Puritan.

Another point in regard to which the reviewer finds us blind and rash, is the *primacy* of Peter, which we are said to confound with the idea of his supremacy. On this subject, we have had some friendly expostulation also from other quarters. Let it be observed, however, that we have not pretended to fix and settle in any way the amount of jurisdiction, which belonged in the Nicene period to the see of Rome; much less to make it of one and the same order, in all respects, with the claims of the Papacy in the middle ages. Our representation has been so worded, as purposely to avoid every question of this sort, by confining itself to the most general view of the primacy, and that which must be considered as underlying the whole doctrine whether held in a higher or lower form. The amount of what we have wished to say is simply this: That the unity of the church, in the first ages, was held to be indispensable to the mystery of its existence and power—That this was taken to stand in the episcopate, as the proper succession of the Apostolic office—That such prerogative belonged to the episcopate only *in solidum*, or to the episcopal college as a whole, which in the nature of the case however must have in such view its own proper centre—That the centre of the original college of the Apostles was St. Peter—That the Roman see, as the *cathedra Petri*, was distinctly acknowledged to be the seat of a similar primacy or centrality afterwards for the universal episcopate, and so we may say also for the universal church. The Epistles of Ignatius, as Professor Rothe has shown we think with overwhelming evidence, are based throughout on this theory, and show it to have been involved in the catholic idea of the church from the beginning. It comes into view plainly enough again in Irenæus and Tertullian, and also in Clement of Alexandria and Origen;

while in Cyprian it is brought out with the most explicit particularity and detail. It is not necessary here to waste time on the question, whether some one passage or so of this writer, directly asserting the primacy of the Roman see, is to be regarded as genuine or spurious; back of every such single dubious text is the universal theory and scheme of the writer, plainly requiring its own consequences, which is of far more weight than any single text separately taken; and what may be doubtful in the case of one passage, is fully made good, as Neander remarks, by the authority of another. The critical settlement of a disputed reading may be of account, for determining the relation of the older view of the ecclesiastical order now under consideration, to the view taken of it afterwards by the Roman church. But for the general fact of this order itself, which is all we have to do with here, it is of no account whatever. We have not said, that the idea of the central position of the Roman see was unshakable at all points, in the Nicene period or in the time of Cyprian, to the full-blown Papacy of the middle ages. It is enough for us to know, that the unity of the church was taken to stand in the solidarity of the episcopate, and that the proper radix and matrix of the whole system, as Cyprian has it, was felt to be the *cathedra Petri*, kept up by regular succession in the church of Rome.

"Nemo fraternitatem mendacio fallat," Cyprian writes, (*De Unitate Eccl.* §. 5.) "nemo fidei veritatem perfida praevaricatione corrumpat. Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia quoque una est, quae in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur, quemodo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum, et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum, et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiae largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origine. Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frangere ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte praecidere rivum, praecisus arescit. Sic et ecclesia Domini, etc."

This we are very sure is not modern Puritanism. But neither does it suit modern Anglicanism. After all, however, it is only one phase among many of the broad difference there is, between Cyprian's Christianity and the Anglican system. The two schemes have in fact very little in common.

J. W. N.

BOOK NOTICES.

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. *Delivered at the University of Virginia, during the Session of 1850-1.* New-York: Carters. 1852. Svo. pp. 606.

DIVISION of labor has done much towards the triumphs and advancement of the present age; in fact it is necessary to the accomplishment of the highest results. The principle is applicable to moral and theological, as well as to mathematical and scientific investigations. The present volume is the product of division of labor. In 1850 a course of Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity was determined upon at the University of Virginia, the ancient seat of Jeffersonian infidelity. A schedule of topics was drawn up, the lecturers appointed, the lectures duly delivered, and they are now given to the reading public in a handsome and convenient form. The lecturers were the Rev. Doctors Plumer, Ruffner, McGill, Sampson, J. W. Alexander, Breckenridge, Green, Rice, and the Rev. Messrs. Van Zandt, Hoge, Moore, Miller, Smith and Robinson. The subjects embrace the vital points in the claims of Christianity, and were evidently chosen with an eye to the problems and conflicts of the present age; including the Geological, Ethnological, and Development questions. The Lectures are manifestly prepared with much care, and form a valuable contribution to American theological literature. Perhaps the circumstances which called them forth have given, at least to some of them, too much of a popular cast to be of much service in the severe scrutiny of the study. Lithograph portraits by Ritchie of all the lecturers, except Dr. Alexander, embellish the volume, and afford an interesting group for the physiognomist. The book is prefaced by a short history of the University of Virginia, by Rev. William H. Ruffner. C.

THE GOLDEN LEGEND. By *Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.* Boston: Ticknor, Reed and Fields. 1852. 12mo. pp. 301.

HITHERTO Longfellow has confined himself, in his poetry, principally to short effusions, characterised by lyrical sweetness and delicate sentiment, without attempting a complicated plot. The present volume partakes more of the character of a work: a steady, sustained effort, evolving dramatic and comic elements, which he has heretofore given no signs of possessing. The sub-

stratum of the poem is a legend of the Middle Ages, which has an interesting progress and a pleasurable denouement. You meet with some fine touches as you pass along, but feel at its close that the Golden Legend is not a great poem.

We notice a tendency among modern poets, strongly illustrated in this book, which we regard with anything but satisfaction. We mean a fondness for artificial and eccentric versification; often to the neglect of all rhythmical rules. It always strikes us as paltry affectation. We are far from regarding a proper succession of long and short syllables, measured accents and smooth endings, as the essentials of poetry; but we do think they cannot be entirely neglected if we would maintain the distinction between poetry and prose. C.

LECTURES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER. By *William R. Williams*. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. 1851. 12mo. pp. 241.

This book is from the pen of one of our favorite American authors. To our mind William R. Williams is seldom surpassed in richness of thought, beauty of imagery, felicitousness of illustration and truthful earnestness of spirit. The present subject is evidently congenial to his mind and he appears to all advantage. It is a book which one may read and feel the better for it. C.

NEANDER'S HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH. Vol. IV. *Translated by Prof. Torrey*. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 1851. Svo. pp. 650.

THE reader of Neander will be thankful, that the labors of the indefatigable translator enable him to place the fourth volume of the author's great History beside the three previously issued. This volume brings the history down to A. D. 1294. It corresponds, in typography and binding, with the former volumes. As we placed it in our library, we involuntarily exclaimed, *clarum et venerabile nomen!* C.

ECLOGÆ EX Q. HORATII FLACCI POEMATIBUS. *Classical series edited by Drs. Schmitz and Zumpt*. Philadelphia: Blanchard and Lea. 1852.

This is one of a series of classical publications, which is winning attention and praise in all directions. The recommendations of a large number of the leading scholars and teachers of

our own country, in addition to the wide European reputation of the work, leave no room to doubt of its high excellence and worth. Its general merits indeed lie open to the most common inspection, we may say, in every volume of the series.

N.

— — —
ANCIENT HISTORY : *from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe, to the Battle of Actium and change of the Roman Republic into an Empire.* By PETER FREDET, D. D., Professor of History in St. Mary's College, Baltimore. Second Edition, revised, enlarged and improved. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1851. Pp. 490.

MODERN HISTORY : *from the coming of Christ, and the change of the Roman Republic into an Empire, to the Year of our Lord 1850.* By PETER FREDET, D. D., Prof. &c. Fifth Edition, enlarged and improved. Baltimore: J. Murphy & Co. 1851. Pp. 552.

The second of these volumes is older than the first, though it comes after it in plan. They are now published together, the two volumes in connection presenting a complete history of the civilized world throughout the whole duration of its existence, from the creation down to the present time, a space of 5850 years. Much care and labor seem to have been bestowed upon the entire work. It is written in clear, chaste style, gives evidence of extensive reading, and forms altogether a well digested compend of universal history. The repeated editions through which it is passing, are a decided proof of its popularity.

N.